A HOMAGE
TO
DR. MAINKAR

Editors

C. R. DESHPANDE NALINEE CHAPEKAR

2
-H

R
891.2
DES-H

R
891.2
DES-H

87319

गुरुकुल कांगड़ी विश्वविद्यालय
कृपया पुस्तक के ऊपर कोई निशान आदि
न लगायें।

पुस्तकालय

गुरुकुल कांगड़ी विश्वविद्यालय,
R हरिद्वार

वर्ग संख्या 891:2 आगत संख्या 87319
DES-H

पुस्तक-वितरण की तिथि नीचे अंकित है। इस तिथि सहित २० वें दिन तक यह पुस्तक पुस्तकालय में वापिस आ जानी चाहिए। अन्यथा १० पैसे के हिसाब से विलम्ब-दण्ड लगेगा।

Stock Verification 2024

A HOMAGE TO DR. MAINKAR

R891.2, DES-H
87319

87319

A HOMAGE TO DR. MAINKAR

A GLIMPSE INTO THE RESEARCH WORK DONE UNDER HIS GUIDANCE

Editors:

C. R. DESHPANDE **NALINEE CHAPEKAR**

BHARATIYA
VIDYA PRAKASHAN
I-U.B, JAWAHAR NAGAR,
BUNGALOW ROAD,
DELHI-7.

1982
Published by Editors at
BHARATIYA
BOOK CORPORATION
I-U.B, JAWAHAR NAGAR
BUNGALOW ROAD,
DELHI-7.
nagar,

Released on September 17, 1982.

© Copyright reserved by the Editors

The book is published with the financial assistance of Tirumala Tirupati Devasthanams.

R
891.2
DES-H

Revised Price Rs. 100/-

Printed by Shri J. N. Creado
at the Bombay University Press, Bombay-400 032.

B.U.P.—J. 71-500-4-82.

Dr. T. G. Mainkar

15-3-1915 b.]   [d. 17-9-1981

॥ त्र्यम्बकं वै यजामहे ॥

"सदाचार्यस्य नैवास्ति विशेषः सुतशिष्ययोः ।
सच्छिष्यस्यापि नैवास्ति जनकाचार्ययोस्तथा ॥"
न तथा तद्गुरुस्थानं विद्वत्त्वं वाधिकारिता ।
शिष्याणां विनयाधानात् पितृत्वं प्रेमकारणम् ॥
अप्रार्थ्याऽपि फलप्राप्तिः शिष्यकल्पद्रुमो मतः ।
स्वयं च सिद्धसंकल्पः मूर्ध्न्यैव सर्वदा स्थितः ॥
विना लक्ष्म हिमकरः तापहीनो दिवाकरः ।
ज्ञानचारित्र्यसंपन्नः माननीयो मनीषिणाम् ॥
काव्यालङ्कारमधुपः कृती वेदान्तवेदवित् ।
तत्त्वसंशोधने मग्नः कलासु कुशलः कविः ॥
सभास्वस्खलितो वक्ता दाताऽयं ज्ञानवित्तयोः ।
शास्त्रवेत्ता ग्रन्थकर्ता चतुरः शासकः प्रभुः ॥
छात्रप्रियः गुरुः श्रेष्ठः ज्ञानसंच्छिन्नसंशयः ।
जीवनेऽपि च छात्राणां सन्मार्गदर्शकोऽभवत् ॥
भक्तियुक्तमनाः सौम्यः गुणज्ञः सर्वकामदः ।
सौजन्यार्जितसत्त्वः स्म नैकाकी रमते कदा ॥
मृगेन्द्रत्वं स्वयंपूर्णं संमानैः संस्कृतं तथा ।
मृदु चाश्वासकं तस्मादादृतं सकलैः सदा ॥
इदं पुण्यं कृपाच्छत्रं रत्नकाञ्चनशोभितम् ।
अकालेऽपहृत्य दैवेन शिष्याः संत्रासिताश्चिरम् ॥
तद्विनाऽनाथीभूताः स्मः भृशं संभ्रान्तचेतसः ।
रिक्तहस्ताः रत्नहीनाः मृत्पात्रैः पूजयामहे ॥
नूनं तदीयमेवेदं तदर्थं चोपहारितम् ।
समर्पयामहे तस्मै त्र्यम्बकं वै यजामहे ॥

—नलिनी

FOREWORD

One can hardly imagine a more tragic irony than that a teacher should be required to write a Foreword to a volume commemorating his student. But this is what fate has ordained for me to do—and that too, by a sad coincidence, in the year in which Mainkar and I had planned to celebrate the golden jubilee of our first acquaintance. When I began my teaching career in June 1932 as a fresh lecturer of Sanskrit in the Fergusson College, Poona, Mainkar was one of the first batch of my students. We had planned to bring together at Poona, in June 1982, as many scholars of that batch as possible and re-live the youthful, blissful, nostalgic days of fifty years ago on the Fergusson College premises. Of course I did not pursue the idea because Mainkar was not going to be there. And what shall I write in this Foreword? If I wrote about the happy times which I was privileged to spend at Mainkar's residence in Delhi or Bombay, that would be too personal and decidedly painful; and if I wrote about his eminent contributions to Sanskrit studies, that would be too formal and manifestly redundant.

To say that Mainkar's untimely death has been a great loss to Sanskrit studies will not adequately reflect the true poignancy of the situation. Those who had been academically associated with him will continue to feel the void as they go on doing their own work. Mainkar was not temperamentally inclined to specialize in any specific branch of Indology. But the scope of his interests was noticeably wide, and his contributions particularly to Vedic studies, Vedānta, and Sanskrit Drama have been admittedly quite illuminating. Incidentally, I often goaded him to be more assertive and emphatic in his writing, but he wisely preferred restraint and moderation. I do not want to perpetrate a truism by saying that Mainkar was a highly successful teacher, but I cannot resist mentioning the paternal care and solicitude which I have often seen him (actively and willingly aided by Mrs. Mainkar) bestow upon his students, quite a few of whom even lived with him, without being made to feel any compunction, with a view to completing their theses under his direct whole-time guidance. It was again this trait of his character which made him a sympathetic and ever-helpful administrator.

If I was asked to summarize Mainkar's way of life in one single word, I would use the word, *bhakti* or 'earnest devotion',—devotion to God, devotion to his father (I have seldom seen him go out without having first bowed down before his father's portrait), and devotion to his work. To this I am tempted also to add devotion to his teachers. To speak for myself, Mainkar never failed to vouchsafe to me the respectful and affectionate consideration due to a venerable teacher. And, though I knew that I did not wholly deserve it, I did not also discountenance it, for, as his teacher, I wanted to become entitled to take partial credit for his many achievements, relying on the dictum : *śiṣyaprakarṣo yaśase gurūṇām.*

I was glad when, after his retirement from the Bombay University, Mainkar joined the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute and took charge of its Post-graduate and Research Department. All of us were looking forward to his long and fruitful tenure at the Institute, but that was not to be ! In Mainkar's case, the use of the phrase 'die in harness' would not be merely conventional. On September 16, 1981, he and I were discussing, at the Institute, with an American colleague some project of academic collaboration, till late in the afternoon. And late at night on that day I unexpectedly received a phone call announcing his death.

A true teacher lives on through his own work ; but he also lives on through the work of his students. So far as Mainkar is concerned, one need not entertain any doubts in respect of the former eventuality. And I welcome the present volume as a satisfying guarantee in respect of the latter.

Na khalu sa (*gurur*) *uparato yasya* (*chātra-*) *janaḥ smarati.*

Bhandarkar Oriental
Research Institute, Poona-411 004.
10th August 1982.

R. N. DANDEKAR

PREFACE

The sudden death of Dr. Mainkar was a great shock to all his friends and colleagues and particularly to his students to whom he was much more than a mere teacher. Here is an attempt to dedicate to his beloved memory this small work comprising of short resume of the various theses for Doctorate degree and different Post-Doctorate projects completed under his able guidance. The articles, unless mentioned otherwise, are based on the Ph.D. theses of the respective students and are arranged under different heads as 'Epics and Smṛtis', 'Pāli and Prakrit', 'Religion and Philosophy', 'Literature and Criticism' and 'Sociology'. Even this short collection bears sufficient testimony to late Dr. Mainkar's versatile scholarship and his profound interest in different branches of Indology. Though a few of the theses have been already published in book form, the articles based on these theses have been included here with a view to highlighting the glorious personality of the Guide. Still the picture cannot be said to be complete as the topics of a few theses like 'Pāṇini—explained and defended', 'Comparative study of Upaniṣads and Tiruvaya Moli', 'Study of Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta' etc. could not be covered in this volume.

Our thanks are due to all the contributors for their co-operation. We are grateful to the authorities of the Bombay University for allowing the University Press to print the volume. We specially mention our thanks to Shri J. N. Creado, I/c Controller, Printing and Stationery, University of Bombay and his staff for bringing out the volume in such a short time and with such a fine get-up.

We express our sincere thanks to Tirumala Tirupati Devasthanam, Tirupati, for their financial assistance and particularly to Prof. K. K. A. Venkatachari, Director, Ananthacharya Indological Research Institute, Bombay, because of whom this help could be available.

The Foreword to this volume by Professor R. N. Dandekar, the teacher of late Dr. Mainkar has a great significance. Late Dr. Mainkar always held him in high esteem. We express our sincere gratitude to Professor Dandekar for his Foreword.

What students owe to their Guru cannot be expressed properly in words. This is the *Kusumāñjali*, paid by the students at the feet of their revered departed Guru. The scope of the volume is thus very limited, and the volume cannot be named as 'Commemorative Volume', which is supposed to be exhaustive by nature.

Dr. Mrs. Nalinee Chapekar Editors.
24, Madhumalati Society,
Behind Ice Factory,
Naupada, Thane-400 602.

CONTENTS

PAGES

FOREWORD —PROF. R. N. DANDEKAR ix

PREFACE xi

A HOMAGE —NALINEE CHAPEKAR xv

DR. T. G. MAINKAR—BIODATA xxi

—BIBLIOGRAPHY xxiii

EPICS AND SMṚTIS

THE SOCIO-LEGAL POSITION OF WOMEN IN THE SMṚTIS OF MANU AND YĀJÑAVALKYA —VIJAYA DEORE 1

STUDIES IN RECENSIONS AND VERSIONS OF THE MAHĀBHĀRATA —C. R. DESHPANDE 18

SIGNIFICANCE OF VYĀGHRA SMṚTI IN DHARMAŚĀSTRA —S. G. MOGHE 33

THE CONCEPT OF RUDRA ŚIVA IN THE LIGHT OF ITS NĀMA-LITERATURE —VIJAYALAXMI S. NAMJOSHI 41

PĀLI AND PRAKRIT

SOCIAL REALITY AS DEPICTED IN THE GĀTHĀSAPTAŚATĪ OF HĀLA —NALINEE CHAPEKAR 53

ANATTĀVĀDA IN THE SUTTAPIṬAKA —JOAQUIN PEREZ. REMON 73

PAGES

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY

PĀÑCARĀTRA SAMHITĀS : A STUDY —P. P. APTE 81

THE CHĀNDOGYA UPANIṢAD AND THE BRAHMASŪTRAS OF BĀDARĀYAṆA : A COMPARATIVE STUDY —S. M. BHATKHANDE 94

*DVAITA SCHOOL OF VEDĀNTA —V. B. INAMDAR 109

BUDDHISM AS PRESENTED BY THE BRAHMANICAL SYSTEMS —CHITRAREKHA KHER 120

THE SIDDHĀNTAMUKTĀVALI OR THE PEARL NECKLACE OF DOCTRINES —JAMES D. REDINGTON 131

LITERATURE AND CRITICISM

A CRITICAL STUDY OF THE MEGHADŪTA OF KĀLIDĀSA IN THE LIGHT OF BHARATA'S RASASŪTRA —R. R. AMBARDEKAR 158

NATURE AND SCOPE OF SANSKRIT LITERARY CRITICISM AS SEEN IN SANSKRIT COMMENTARIES —SUDHA S. BHIDE 169

COMMENTARIES ON THE UTTARA-RĀMACARITA : A CRITICAL STUDY —JAYA CHANDRAMAULI 174

RĀMAPĀṆIVĀDA—A STUDY OF HIS WORKS IN SANSKRIT AND PRAKRIT —SWARNALATHA G. PAI 189

THE ELEMENTS OF POETRY IN YOGAVĀSIṢṬHA —M. B. WANI 204

SOCIOLOGY

VEDIC HINDU AND TRIBAL MARRIAGE —USHA M. APTE 223

A HOMAGE

NALINEE CHAPEKAR

Professor T. G. Mainkar was a veritable embodiment of simple living and sublime thinking. He had been kind, compassionate and considerate as what a father could be to his children. His august personality had many fascinating facets. He had the rare combination of being a scholarly researcher, an able diligent administrator and above all a 'gentle-man' of the type '*para-guṇaparamāṇūn parvatīkaroti*'. To write about the last first, Mainkar was always 'loved' by his students and colleagues. Probably there were better principals known for discipline and scholarly teachers known for their learning; but when in difficulty, students always turned to Prof. Mainkar. Everyone used to be welcome at his home and was received with good food for mind, thought and for body, of course, by Mrs. Mainkar with affection. Though philosophical in his inclinations he always liked chitchatting. A good sport in his early life, he remained enthusiastic till the end of his life. He was always fascinated by newness. Originally a lover of classical music and sitar his artistic sensibility was all-embracing. He was very particular about the aesthetic qualities—may it be a show-piece on the wall, a delicious dish on the table, a lecture in hall or a research paper in the conference; he expected everything to be clean and tidy and beautiful. His Ph.D. students know how keen he was about the aesthetic aspect of a thesis. Lover of '*sundara*', he was the worshipper of '*Śiva*' and follower of '*satya*'. All his writings begin with a homage to *Nṛsimhasaraswatī*. In the administrative field he was known for his truthfulness, and straightforwardness. He used to be congenial and lenient to the point of inviting criticism. Inspite of such rare qualities he had a nervous temparament. He did not have the boldness to ignore criticism, though unfair, against him, and at times it became diffcult to console him. Perhaps this was the result of his full-fledged involvement in the work he had undertaken. He would never go to the class, unprepared; would never write an article without going through all the available material; would never deliver a lecture, without having the manuscript typed twice or thrice. Being satisfied with such a perfect preparation he naturally expected his students and listeners to be well-attentive. He would never repeat a point or quote a full-line. His principalship brought him into contact with many needy and deserving students. Impressed by his kindness and sympathising nature, students continued to keep their contacts with him, though they left the institution. Students in the field of Sanskrit had the advantage both of his generous nature and genuine scholarship. They respectfully honoured and heartily loved their Guru. Mainkar always acknowledged his debt to his Guru Prof. R. N. Dandekar. He, in turn, had the honour of being remembered by his students who equally acknowledge their debt to him.

Veda, Vedānta and Sāhitya were the branches of his interest. One can observe stages of development in the career of any personality. The first stage, as Mainkar himself observed in connection with Kālidāsa, is usually the period in the workshop, when one is working as an apprentice, trying to acquire technical skill. The books like *Saṁdhis and Saṁdhyaṅgas*, which he worked out for his Ph.D., the *Gītābhāṣyaprakāśa* and the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* could be put forth as marking the first stage of his development. Here one sees the labour, the efforts, deep study of the texts and of course, scholarship. That he chose the crucial texts like the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, the *Gītā* and the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* for his research projects in the beginning, would indicate his enthusiastic and studious nature.

The books like *Mysticism*... and *Kālidāsa* . clearly reflect his remarkable genius and particular bent of mind. In *Kālidāsa* .. he boldly put forward his controversial theory of 'Iśvarakṛṣṇa-Kālidāsa, supporting it with massive evidence. As he himself was convinced of the theory, he continued to expound it again and again in his research papers and lectures. Equally ingenious is his justification of the *Kumārasaṁbhava*. This kāvya has faced criticism right from the ancient erudites like Mammaṭa and Ānandavardhana till the modern scholars. Still he preferred to defend it because of his own philosophy of life, which he put, ‘Human life with its different emotions, flaws and imperfections is a thing to be lived through with due interest’ (*Kālidāsa* .. p. 64). In the same book one sees his restrained criticism of Tagore's views against Dushyanta, the poetical appreciation of the *Meghadūta* and correct evaluation of the *Raghuvaṁśa*. Poetry and philosophy always went hand in hand in his personality. In his *Mysticism in the Ṛgveda* he explains how the *Ṛgveda* supplies the basic structure of later Indian mysticism (p.121). Having examined the traditional, rational and mystical elements of religion in the *Ṛgveda*, he observes, ‘The *Ṛgveda* is an epoch in itself and reveals to us all the aspects of religion that Pratt and others have seen in other faiths.’ (p. 116). Here he refers to all the elements, generally discussed in connection with Western mysticism and applies them to the Ṛgvedic mysticism. He always made full justice to the topic undertaken for study. More than mysticism, perhaps, he was attracted and impressed by the ‘sincerity and sublimity of Ṛgvedic imagination’, ‘baffling variety of Ṛgvedic poetical composition’. It is a treat to the readers to go through his fine comments upon *RV* I. 92.10 *punaḥ punaḥ jāyamānā purāṇī* (*Ṛgvedic Foundations*...p. 30) or upon the Forest song of Devamuni *RV*X.146 (*ibid* p.32). His *Upabṛṁhaṇa*...provides insight into his studied and scholarly interpretation of Mudgala-Mudgalānī *RV*. X. 102, Agastya-Lopāmudrā *RV*. I. 179, etc. That he was wellversed both in art and science of poetry is clear from his discussion of ‘craft theory’ of poetry in the *Ṛgveda*, (*Ṛgvedic Foundation* ...p. 18); the explanation in this connection, of *ratham na dhīraḥ svapā atakṣiṣuḥ*...*RV* I.130.6; and the philological similarity between the Sanskrit root *Takṣ* in *atakṣiṣuḥ* and the English word ‘technique’. Attention also could be drawn towards the application of Mammaṭa's maxims ‘*kāvyam yaśase arthakṛte*...’ and ‘*kāvyajñaśikṣayābhyāsa*...’ to the *Ṛgveda* and towards the attempts of seeing the roots of *rasa* theory of classical poetics in Soma-rasa and of *Rīti* and *Vakrokti* in *matim supūtām* and *suvṛkti* of the Ṛgvedic poets. (*Ṛgvedic Foundations*...p.62). Ingenious matter and beautiful manner have been successfully blended here. His *Studies in Dramatic criticism* clearly shows his power of keen and critical aethetic appreciation.

The two Sanskrit compositions *Smṛtitaraṅgam* and *Gāyikā*... and *The Making of the Vedānta* belong to the period when Mainkar was 'on the heights'. The two poems established him as *kavi.* Here also the peculiar 'Mainkar-stamp' of 'something new' is unmistakably clear. The first poem *Smṛti*.. is an elegy in the real sense of the term, first of its kind in Sanskrit literature. Here the delicate topic of the loss of beloved wife is expressed in an elegant style. While reading the poem, one is often reminded of the Marathi poet Madhava-Julian, the author of *Virahataraṅga* and the ancient Sanskrit poets like Kālidāsa and others. It is not easy to forget lines like *aśrūtsarge bhavati viśadaṃ dhautaduḥkhaṃ hi cetaḥ* (*Smṛti*...19.5) or *kācādarśaḥ prabhavati jaḍo bimbanārthe samagram | kāvyādarśaḥ bhavati viphalo vyaktisāmarthyahīnaḥ ||* (*Smṛti*...18.5). In the *Gāyikā*... Mainkar introduced the new form of expression henceforth unknown to Sanskrit—the sonnet. This again shows his close acquaintance with Western literature and criticism. Mainkar was very 'modern' in his thinking and in the informal talks, always stressed the need of applying Sanskrit theories and methods to modern literature and topics of the present time. Thus he tried to explain the modern Marathi plays with the Rasa-theory of Bharata. He always used to wonder why the cases of *Siddhānta-kaumudī* should be explained with the examples like *daṇḍena yati* and not with any one from poetry. He emphasised that students of Sanskrit should also be familiar with modern literary movements.

He certainly did have philosophical, mystical inclinations. Could it be a mere coincidence that the last proposed unpublished book of this devotee of Śiva was on Śaṅkarācārya? This work and *The Making of the Vedānta* are the flowers of his full-bloomed personality. They have both a lyrical expression and intense scholarship. Mainkar was interested in individuals, their minds and methods. Consequently one gets in these works the studied history of thought in a beautiful and deceptively simple style. The phrases which he chose such as 'rich vagueness' of the Upaniṣads (*Making*...p.32); 'shrewd silence' of the Bhagavadgītā about Buddhism (*ibid.* p.75); 'absurdly simple' philosophical matters of Gauḍapāda (*ibid* p. 99) and many more are the specimens which reveal the eloquence as well as the fullness of style. The chapter headings like 'Bhagavadgītā—the philosophical drama'

'Gauḍapāda the philosopher with tension' deserve notice. One would always remember his brilliant evaluation of Bādarāyaṇa and the Bhagavadgītā : 'Bādarāyaṇa was an academician with a logical training but with an obedient mind. The author of the Bhagavadgītā was a poet-philosopher' (p.83). He always evaluates the works with reference to their social background as is clear from his discussion of the Upaniṣads (p.35) and the Bhagavadgītā (p.75). As Mainkar's views on different problems were original, he had to criticise the views of other gerat scholars on many occasions. But this too he did in his characteristic light vein without sacrificing due firmness. For example when he writes about Dasgupta and Karmarkar on Gauḍapāda, he observes, 'I really hesitate to accept all these pronouncements inspite of the eminence of those from whom they come' (p.108). He does criticise in details Dr. Belvalkar's theory about Chāndogya-Brahmasūtra and Khair's theory about the authorship of the Bhagavadgītā ; but his stress is more on the presentation of evidence, gathered by him, than on refutation. In the '*Making of the Vedānta*', one gets his studied views about Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja, Madhva and Vallabha, as 'Śaṅkarācārya developed the thought of the *Chāndogya*, the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* and the *Taittirīya Upaniṣads* while these other schools developed the thought of the *Iśāvāsya* and the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣads*'. 'If Śānkarācārya satisfies us by his originality and boldness in his philosophical thought, the others arrest our attention because they have the weight of tradition behind' (p.159). About these several learned commentators Mainkar gives the cautious suggestions to the beginners, 'A student of *Sūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa must take the help of many commentaries, available, to understand them but having done this must also make an effort to forget them if he has a mind to understand the real'. This is Mainkar. He himself struggled to achieve his goal and helped others who were struggling to achieve it. Thanks to his assuring nature there never occured a gap between him and his students. Though he reahed the heights, students always took him as one amongst themselves.

Mainkar had guided many students and had not merely guided them. He had given them the power of vision, and had added an element of dimension and direction to their lives and careers. He thus fitted the concept of an ideal teacher put forth by Kālidāsa as his ātmasaṁsthā kriyā ' was ' śliṣṭā ' and ' saṁkrānti ' was ' viśeṣa-yuktā '. He guided his students not only on Vedānta, Sāhitya and Alaṁkāras but also on topics related to Pāli, Prakrit, Buddhism and sociology. True, śāstras like Mīmāṁsā, Nyāya and Vyākaraṇa never became the subjects of his research. Even then he was ready to read the manuscript of Mīmāṁsā with colleague, was prepared to guide on Pāṇini and willing to help in the comparison of a Sanskrit text with the South Indian one. Because of this rare willingness to help, along with the assuring behaviour and scholarly treatment, many Indian as well as foreign students were attracted to him. Though Mainkar is no more, his innumerable students will treasure in the heart of their hearts the bright image of their ' erudite father ', their ' loveable teacher '.

TRYAMBAK GOVIND MAINKAR

Born : 15th March, 1915
Died : 17th September, 1981

B.A. (Sanskrit-English), Bombay University	1935
M.A. (Sanskrit-Ardhamāgadhī), Bombay University	1937
M.A. (Marathi-Pāli), Bombay University	1942
Ph.D., Bombay University	1943
Won V. N. Mandlik Prize, Bombay University	1943
D.Litt. (Sanskrit), Bombay University	1962
Professor of Sanskrit, Marathi—	
Willingdon College, Sangli	1940-56
Fergusson College, Pune	1956-67
Secretary,	
Deccan Education Society, Pune	1963-64
Principal,	
Fergusson College, Pune	1964-67
Pt. Dar Professor of Sanskrit and Head, Delhi University, Delhi	1967-69
R. G. Bhandarkar Professor and Head, Department of Sanskrit, Pāli and Prakrit University of Bombay, Bombay.	1969-78
Director, Post-graduate and Research Department, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune	1979-81

Closely associated with the institutions like—

Deccan College, Pune
Vaidik Samsodhan Mandal, Pune

Rashtriya Sanskrit Samsthan, New Delhi
National Council for Educational Research and
Training, New Delhi.
Kane Research Institute, Asiatic Society, Bombay.
Ananthacharya Indological Research Institute, Bombay.

Was Awarded—

Silver Medal, Asiatic Society, Bombay	1974
M. M. Kane Gold Medal, Asiatic Society, Bombay	1977
Mahāmahopādhyāya, Akhil Bharatiya Pandit Parishad, Varanasi.	1977
U.G.C. National Lecturer	1971-72

Delivered Lecturers in different Memorial Lecture-Series like—

B. V. Ashtekar, Pune University, Pune.
P. M. Lad, Ministry of Broadcasting, Govt. of India, New Delhi.
Kaushik, S. P. Mandali, Pune.
K. P. Khadilkar, Natya Praishad, Bombay.
Dr. A. D. Pusalkar, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay.
R. B. Gadgil, Nagpur University, Nagpur.
H. R. Karnik, Bombay University, Bombay.
H. D. Velankar, Haritosh Samiti, Bombay.

Also—

L. D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad
L. B. Shastri Sanskrit Vidyapeeth, New Delhi.
Marathwada University Extension Lectures, Aurangabad.
Vikram University Extension Lectures, Ujjain.
S.N.D.T. University Extension Lectures, Bombay.
Kurukshetra University Extension Lecturers, Kurukshetra.
Max Muller Bhavan, Bombay.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. *Books*

1. *The Vāsiṣṭha Rāmāyaṇa—A Study*, 2nd ed. Meharchand Lachhmandas, New Delhi, (1955), 1976.
2. *The Gitā Bhāṣya Prakāśa*, 2nd Ed., Motilal Banarasidas, Delhi, (1955), 1968.
3. *The Theory of Sandhis and Sandhyaṁgas in the Nāṭyaśāstra*, 2nd Ed., Ajanta Publications, Delhi, 1960.
4. *Mysticism in the Ṛgveda*, Popular Book Depot, Bombay, 1961.
5. *Kālidāsa, His Art and Thought*, Deshmukh Prakashan, Poona, 1962.
6. *Some Poetical Aspects of Ṛgvedic Repetitions*, Poona University, Poona, 1966.
7. *Vaidik Saṁhitā va Upaniṣade* (Marathi), S. P. Mandali, Poona, 1970.
8. *Studies in Sanskrit Dramatic Criticism*, Motilal Banarasidas, Delhi, 1971.
9. *Ṛgveda-Kavi-vimarśaḥ* (Sanskrit), 1971.
10. *Upabṛṁhaṇa and the Ṛgvedic Interpretation*, L. D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad, 1974.
11. *Vaidarbhīya Saṁskrit Vāṅmaya āṇi Kāvyaśāsrīya vicāra* (Marathi), Nagpur University, Nagpur, 1974.
12. *Ṛgvedic Foundation of Classical Poetics*, Ajanta Publications, Delhi, 1977.
13. *History of Sanskrit Literature*, for NCERT, NCERT, Delhi, 1978.
14. *Making of the Vedānta*, Ajanta Publications, Delhi, 1978.
15. On Śaṅkarācārya (Unpublished).

II. Compositions in Sanskrit

1. *Śmṛti-taraṅgam* (poem), Self, 1975.
2. *Gāyikāśilpakāram* (poem), Self, 1979.

III. Works Edited

1. *Sāṁkhya Kārikā* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa, Oriental Book Agency, Poona, 1964.
2. *Proceedings of the Prakrit Seminar* (UGC), Bombay University, Bombay, 1971.
3. *Prakrit Mañjarī of Ghanaśyāma*, *Proceedings of the Prakrit Seminar*, Bombay University, Bombay, 1971.
4. *Writings and Speeches of Dr. Bhau Daji*, for Bombay University, Bombay University, Bombay, 1974.
5. *Śivarājyābhiṣekaprayoga of Gāgābhaṭṭa*, (Sanskrit text), Bombay University, Bombay, 1974.
6. *Some Aspects of Indo-Iranian Cultural Traditions*, (Dr. V. G. Paranjpe Comm. Volume), Ajanta Publications, Delhi, 1977.
7. *Raṅgiṇi, Selections from Sanskrit Drama for Std. XI* for NCERT, NCERT, Delhi, 1977.
8. *Sarvadarśanasaṁgraha* for Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, *BORI*, Poona, 1978.
9. *Prabhuvaṁśa* of Govinda, *JUB*, Bombay, 1978.

IV. Reviews of Books

1. Urmila Bhagowalia—Vaiṣṇavism and Society in Northern India, *ABORI*, LXI, 1980.
2. B. N. Bhatt—Śrīkaṇṭhacaritam—A Study.
3. S. A. Dange—Vedic Concept of Field and Divine Fructification *JUB* 41, 1972.

4. Chaitanya P. Desai—Bhāratabhāṣyam of Nānya Bhūpāla, *ABORI*, LXI, 1980.
5. S. M. Ghosal—The Inception of the Sanskrit Drama, *ABORI*, LXI, 1980.
6. S. K. Gupta—Madhusūdana Sarasvatī on the Bhagavadgītā, *ABORI*, LXI, 1980.
7. S. D. Joshi,—C A S S Studies, No. 3, *ABORI*, LX, 1979,
8. V. R. Karandikar—Granthavedha, *Samaj Prabhodhan Patrikā* (Marathi), Jan.-Feb., 1979.
9. Robert C. Lester—Rāmānuja on the Yoga, *ABORI*, LX, 1979.
10. V. V. Mirashi—Literary and Historical Studies in Indology, *JOI*, XXVI, No. 3, 1977.
11. V. Raghavan—Sanskrit and Allied Indian Studies in US, *ABORI*, LX 1979.
12. Rosane Rocher (Ed.)—India and Indology (Select articles by W. Norman Brown), *ABORI*, LXI, 1980.
13. E. A. Solomon—Commentaries of Sāṁkhyakārikā—A Study, *ABORI*, LX, 1979.
14. Kālidāsa and South Indian Literature,- *ABORI*, LXI, 1979.

V. *Articles*

1. Mahābhārata 1.3.62—it's text and meaning, SP (18th AIOC), Annamalianagar, 1955.
2. Early Antecedent of the Vibhūtiyoga in the Bhagavadgītā Ch. 10, *H. D. Velankar Commemoration Volume*, 1965, p. 72.
3. Sir Raghunath P. Paranjape, *ABORI*, 45, 1966, p. 17.
4. Lahari-kāvyas in Sanskrit, *Research*, 67-68, pp. 4-5.
5. Īśvarakṛṣṇa, Bhartṛmiḍha and Kālidāsa, again, *JUB*, Oct, 1970, pp. 58-65.

6. German Contribution to the Upaniṣadic Studies, Paper read on the occasion of the Exhibition on Indology in Germany, organised by Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1971.
7. Human Tradition in Sanskrit Literature, Paper read at the Writers' Camp organised by the National Book Trust at Pune, 1971.
8. Writer as means of change, Paper read at the Writers' Camp organised by the National Book Trust at Delhi, 1972.
9. Professor Hiriyanna—A critical Editor, *The Mysore Orientalist*, V, Sept., 1972.
10. New Light on Kālidāsa, International Sanskrit Conference held at Delhi, 1972.
11. 'The Syād-vāda of the Jaina Philosophy—A contribution to Indian Epistemology', *Proceedings of Seminar* on 'Contribution of Jainism' . . . . , 1973.
12. 'Max Muller and Vedānta,' Paper read at the Symposium organized on the occasion of the 1st Birth Anniversary of F. Maxmuller by the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan and Max Muller Bhavan, Bombay, 1973.
13. 'Kālidāsa on Some Aesthetic problems,' *Journal of Ganganath Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth*, Allahabad, Vol. XXIX, 1973.
14. 'Vedic Gods and later Sanskrit literature,' *Rajasthan University Studies in Sanskrit and Hindi*, No. VI, 1973-74.
15. 'Śaṅkara and Rāmāuja on Bhagavadgītā,' Proceedings of Seminar on Bhagavadgītā, organised by the Kurukshetra University, 1974.
16. 'Hymn of Mudgala Bharmyasva (RV X. 102)'—A fresh approach,' *Sambodhi* 4(2), pp. 1-22, 1975.
17. 'Literature and Darśanas' Ramakrishna Gopal Bhandarkar—As an Indologist, A Symposium, *BORI*, Poona, 1976.
18. 'Vāmana's contribution to Sanskrit Poetics,' *JOI*, Baroda, Vol. 25 (3—4), pp. 299—303, 1976.

19. ' Religion in Aśvaghoṣa and Kālidāsa ', Special No. of the *Journal of Karnatak University*, Vol. 20, pp. 123—129, 1976.

20. ' A Comparative Study of Sanskrit literature,' *Journal of the Jadhavpur University*, Calcutta, 1977.

21. ' Contribution of Dr. R. G. Bhandarkar to Philosophy and Literature,' *BORI*, Volume on Dr. Bhandarkar, 1977.

22. ' Systems of Indian Philosophy '—Centenary Volume of the Veda-Shastrottejak Sabha, Pune, 1977.

23. ' Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta,' *Dr. Viramani Upadhaya Fel. Volume*, Benaras, 1978.

24. Notes on technical words from Sanskrit Poetics, contribution to the proposed Dictionary by Marathi Grantha Sangrahalaya, Bombay, 1978.

25. ' Problem of Prakrit verses in Vikramorvaśīyam ', *Dr. V. G. Paranjpe Memorial Volume*, 1978.

26. ' Some thoughts on the Brahmasūtras and the Bhagavadgītā,' *ABORI*, Diamond Jubilee Volume, pp. 745-755, 1978.

27. ' Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta,' *JASB*, Vol. 52-53, 1981.

EPICS AND SMṚTIS

THE SOCIO-LEGAL POSITION OF WOMEN IN THE SMṚTIS OF MANU AND YĀJÑAVALKYA*

VIJAYA DEORE

Introduction

THE position of women in any civilisation is an index of the stage of its culture. If this is true, this Thesis will depict the cultural stage of the Aryan-Society, from 200 B.C. to 200 A.D, which later on came to be called as the Hindu Society. Here legal system is selected to depict the social life of women in this period, because Law Texts are more reliable for depicting the society than fictions. The Smṛti Literature being extremely extensive and of multifarious nature, the entire Smṛti literature is not taken into consideration but only two Smṛtis those of Manu and Yājñavalkya, which are considered to be outstanding mile stones in the History of Dharmaśāstra, are taken for this study.

It is a popular belief that Manu enslaved woman in perpetual bondage and that his utterences in her favour contain only empty flattery. This charge seems to be unjust, because Manu had put restrictions on the liberties of all the members in the family to make home a stable unit. It seems that he did this from the point of view of making society stable and uniform. Manu on the contrary tried to raise woman from that abject state and gave her the status of respectable member of the household and the society. In many respects Yājñavalkya followed Manu so far as women were concerned; but in case of inheritance he made an advance by recognising woman's right to inherit the property of her husband and of her father. In ancient days the birth of a girl was not welcomed and this is particularly true in patriarchal society like the Aryan-society.

Daughter—Childhood and Education

A daughter was considered to be a positive impediment (*Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* 33.1). But this may not be taken as a representative opinion, since we come across some rites performed with a desire to get a learned daughter. Manu also regards a daughter as an object of the highest tenderness. He probably agrees with the *Mahābhārata* dictum " The Goddess of Wealth resides in the maidens." In the Vedic period the girls enjoyed unrestricted educational facilities and could perform Vedic rites. The tradition continued till Smṛti period, where there is no mention of girl's education. During this period they used to give offerings without uttering Mantras, and all ceremonies in their cases were performed without Mantras. The Upanayana without Mantras was absurd and hence Manu discontinued girl's Upanayana. He identified girl's marriage with her Upanayana. " The nuptial ceremony is stated to be the Vedic Sacrament for women (and as being equal to initiation), serving the husband (as being equivalent to) the residence in (the house of the) teacher, and household duties (the same) as the (daily) worship of the Sacred fire." (*Manu* II.67).

---

* submitted to the University of Poona in 1971.

This naturally brought an end to girl's education, and identification of marriage ceremony with that of Upanayana pushed down the marriageable age of girls' from 8 to 12, which was the age of Upanayana for boys from different Varṇas. When the girl got married between the age of 8 and 12, choice for choosing the partner was no more her previlege, and she had to marry a person chosen by her parents and in their absence by other relatives. Even though Manu and Yājñavalkya prescribed child marriage for girls, they took utmost care to protect them and laid down that the girls should be given in an educated family, and money should not be the consideration while choosing the bride-groom, and if suitable bride-groom was not available, she should not be given in marriage to any unworthy person. She can remain in her father's house till her death. (*Manu* IX.89).

Marriage

Marriage as an institution was, present in Aryan society from the hoary antiquity. Śvetaketu's story about Uttarkuru does not show the then present social condition of the Aryans but refers to some aboriginal clan where marriage was not compulsory and that society was in the stage of promiscuity. There is no reference to promiscuous life in the Vedic texts and we find that at the time of Manu, institution of marriage was deep rooted in the society and the wife was given very respectable position in the house, a position of Gṛhapatnī, and not of a female slave. The word Gṛhapatnī indicates that the wife was an equal partner of the husband in the household.

The marriage ritual was very simple in Vedic period and consisted of various elements but gradually it gathered a pomp and Manu accepted this heritage from the earlier period with certain changes which the times demanded, such as bringing down the marriageable age to pre-puberty period from that of a grown up age of a girl at the time of the marriage. This made the wife subservient to her husband and on account of this, Manu was considered to be very unjust towards women, very orthodox and puritanical social thinker. But what was done by Manu appears to be the outcome of social compulsions. Manu was probably aware of the changes he was introducing. As far as possible he has tried to be considerate to women. This is clearly seen in his instructions for choosing a worthy bridegroom from worthy and educated family without any consideration for money. He insists on a family where Vedic studies are persued. This obviously means that Manu wanted to compensate for the lack of education in the girl. He could not champion the cause of woman's education because the social conditions were extremely adverse but he tried to counteract them in a soft manner without denouncing the social pattern. He was rather a reformist than a revolutionary.

Yājñavalkya agrees with Manu so far as choice of the bridegroom and marriageable age of the girl are concerned. Both of them think that the girl should be given in marriage before puberty. Manu allowed a girl to stay in the father's house till death rather than marrying an unworthy person but commentators tried to show that Yājñavalkya does not agree with Manu on this point and he prescribes that even an unworthy bride-groom can be chosen rather than keeping the girl unmarried. Yājñavalkya insists on the virginity of a girl at the time of the marriage.

CC-0. In Public Domain. Gurukul Kàngri Collection, Haridwar

Manu mentions eight forms of marriage. Yājñavalkya has also mentioned all eight forms but he has not used strong language of condemnation for the later forms.

Inter-caste marriage

The caste system in the Hindu society is the most intriguing social phenomenon. The divisions based on birth became established during the Sūtra period and from this period onwards caste depended on birth. Sub-caste was the outcome of inter-caste marriages. Naturally all Sūtrakāras and Smṛtikāras have dealt with this topic in detail. Manu in X.5 states—" In all castes (Varṇas) those (children) only which are begotten in direct order on wedded wives, equal (in caste and married as) virgin, are to be considered as belonging to the same caste (as their fathers)."

Yājñavalkya also prescribes a marriage with a Sajāti girl and says that through the sons born out of the blameless wedlocks continues the line. If such blameless marriages had been universal there would not have been a problem of sub-castes. Society is a human organisation and not a machine. Inspite of the rules, the marriages between different castes continued to be there.

If the marriage were with a Sagotra or within the prohibitive degrees the offsprings did not get the caste of their father. (*Manu* X.24). Anuloma marriage was another reason for confusion of castes. In short all off-springs of " irregular " unions were outcastes, irrespective of the caste or castes of the two spouses. The discussion of inter-caste marriages gives the impression that the sub-castes were the outcome of the confusion of castes *i.e.* mixed marriages and not by their occupation. On the contrary their occupations were determined by their birth. The principle of *pitṛsāvarṇya* was accepted in case of a marriage in the same caste but otherwise the tendency was to give lower caste to an offspring. Neither *Pitṛsāvarṇya* nor *Mātṛsāvarṇya* was strictly followed. If these two had been accepted there would not have been several sub-castes resulting from inter-caste marriages.

Different status was given to different wives of a person from different castes. The authority to assist the husband in daily rites was given to a wife from the same caste, younger in age and married according to the legal and approved forms. In the matter of treatment and status given to wives Yājñavalkya follows Manu. The share in property, given to the son of a person also differs according to the caste of his mother. (*Manu* IX.151), but the son born of a Śūdra woman is not entitled to any inheritance (*Manu* IX. 155). This seems to be the prohibition so far as the share in the land is concerned. Otherwise a son of a Śūdra wife gets $\frac{1}{4}$ of the portion of the property of a son of a Brāhmaṇa wife. Marriages with Śūdra girls continued in the society but the main anxiety was that they would not be the first wives of any twice born. Manu, though discouraged such marriages, reluctantly accepted them, but Yājñavalkya shows strong resentment about the marriage of a twice born with a Śūdra woman (Yāj. 1.56). The change in the attitude of Yājñavalkya could be because of the revival of Brahmanical religion in Puśyamitra's reign. Manu and Yājñavalkya deal with uplift of castes. If a woman marries a man from a higher caste and this process continues in her family for seven generations then the girl in the seventh generation gets the status of that higher caste to which her husband belongs, according to Manu and Yājñavalkya.

Pratiloma marriages

Marriages between a woman of a higher caste and a man of a lower caste were considered low and against the law. Whether *partiloma* union was approved after going through the appropriate marriage ritual or it was considered as illegal, is not clear from other Dharma Sūtras but Manu declared that such marriages were in violation of sacred law and offsprings of such unions became Śūdras. (*Manu* X.41) and they are lower in status than any of the parents. When a Śūdra marries a girl from a Brāhmaṇa caste the offspring is not only a Śūdra but untouchable and is called a Cāṇḍāla. Manu considers Cāṇḍāla as being excluded from the Āryan community. The offspring of a Cāṇḍāla from a woman of any caste is Cāṇḍāla. All such offsprings are called Bāhyas. Manu has also mentioned the offsprings of doubly mixed castes but according to him all *pratiloma* unions are objectionable and much more so if the union is between a Śūdra male and a female of the highest caste. Manu does not allow Cāṇḍālas to hold any property. Their only wealth is dogs and donkeys and they stay outside the village. Yājñvalkya deprecates any *pratiloma* marriage and gives stress on Sajāti marriages. He opposes and disapproves *pratiloma* union. The effort of both Manu and Yājñvalkya is to preserve the purity of Aryan blood. But several Śūdras and progeny of mixed marriages had already been absorbed in the society and it seems that they only succeeded in making the caste system immutable.

Polyandry

Dharmasūtras and Dharmaśāstras never contemplated polyandry. On the contrary they insisted that a woman can have only one husband during the whole life. Manu and Yājñavalkya also propounded the same principle.

Polygamy

Polygamy is evident from both Manu and Yājñavalkya but it was not granted as a license (*Manu* IX. 40). Even Yājñavalkya gives different rules about the supersession of a wife. But they never allow the abandonment of a good and virtuous wife (*Yāj.* 1.76). Superseding a wife without reason is considered to be a crime and penalty is prescribed for it. Polygamy cannot be said to be a matter of universal practice. Amongst the learned and respectable people it was rarely current. In the rich households it was a common practice and later on became a status symbol.

Divorce

There are verses in *Manu* referring to the abandonment of a wife and some references to wives abandoning husbands, but they do not mean a divorce in the sense of the term we understand it today (*Manu* IX.176). Only in exceptional cases Manu allows remarriage and even the remarriage of a widow, but there is emphsis on virginity and the first wedding is considered not to have taken place at all and hence it can be said that Manu does not approve of a divorce. *Manu* IX.176 is considered by some scholars as referring to a divorce because after physical separation for certain period or abandonment, another marriage is prescribed ;

naturally the earlier one is dissolved, but as said above it is considered not to have taken place at all. According to Hindus, marriage was not a contract but a sacrament and hence no dissolution of a marriage tantamounting to a divorce is allowed. Manu very reluctantly accepts Niyoga instead of remarriage. When Manu does not permit a widow to remarry, except when she is a virgin, it is unthinkable that he would permit a wife, whose husband is alive, to divorce him and to take another one. Manu believes, "Once a wife always a wife" (IX. 47) and we can therefore conclude that Manu does not allow a divorce. Yājñavalkya also does not support divorce, on the contrary he gives emphasis on mutual fidelity. He does not allow dissolution of marriage under any circumstance.

Widow

Position of widows in Hindu society was very miserable. She had to face mental and physical torture.

Niyoga

Manu vehemently opposed Niyoga and even remarriage stating that they are not heard of and had no basis in the *Vedas* (*Manu* IX.65). Yājñavalkya in II.127 discusses remarriage and Niyoga and then opposes them and hence, it could be concluded that these customs existed before Manu and Yājñavalkya but these two puritanic law givers opposed them and in the following era the practices gradually disappeared. *Manu* III.174 raises a controversy regarding two kinds of sons *viz* Kuṇḍa and Golaka. They are sons born by wives of other men. The son who is born while the husband lives is Kuṇḍa and born after the husband's death is Golaka. According to some they are the sons by appointment (Kṣetraja) and according to others they are born of illicit intercourse. But when the majority of Dharmasūtrakāras give names of various kinds of sons it is clear that such sons, the product of Niyoga, remarriage, illicit relations existed in the society and it becomes clear that Manu knew that such appointments were legal, but he wanted to discourage and stop them, so he made the rules of Niyoga more and more strict; and considered the progeny of such relations as base and useless so far as emancipation of ancestors was concerned (*Manu* VII.175).

Such sons were useless in this life as well as in life after death. They were never invited for *Śrāddha* feasts, which were important events in social and religious life.

Manu's treatment of Niyoga and remarriage suggests that Manu was fighting with Artha school. He wanted to save the society from the fierce onslaught of other heterodox sects which shook the roots of the Vedic Religion and the society based on Varṇas. The harmonious co-operation of the Varṇas was the very basis of the Indo-Aryan society, and Manu's attempt was to achieve the revival of that society. So he set aside all customs which according to him were not respectable in the orthodox society. Niyoga had come to stay in society and it was resorted to, by people of higher Varṇas and Manu's conscience rose in revolt against it and obliged him to denounce Niyoga as fit for beasts and cattle. The principle that "the maiden is given only once" helped him in denouncing remarriage.

The state of being sonless was one of the conditions which permitted Niyoga. Manu wanted to discontinue the custom of Niyoga completely. Thereforce he declared that, if among several brothers (only) one brother has a son, other brothers will be looked upon as having a son. Similarly he also declared that if among several wives of a man one wife has a son other wives are considered to be mothers of that son. Thus there is no state of being without a son and hence there is no need of Niyoga also (IX.182, 183).

Though Manu has discontinued Niyoga, son born of Niyoga is given a place by him, next to the Aurasa son, for Niyoga was observed with the permission of the elderly people and that too with strict rules and regulations and not out of any lust for sexual relations. In case of remarriage Manu makes an exception for a child-widow. (*Manu* IX.176).

Yājñvalkya has not dealt with this topic so copiously as Manu; but it can be said that bracketing a deflowered widow with a virgin widow Yājñavalkya widened the scope of the widows eligible for marriage sacrament for the second time. We have only two verses in *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* on the practice of Niyoga, and it can be said that Yājñavalkya probably wants to draw the attention of the society to the importance of observing the most important rules of Niyoga ; because Niyoga probably continued inspite of Manu's condemnation. However, Yājñavalkya has given detailed instructions to widows for their behaviour after the death of their husbands. He advises a widow to stay with her nearest relatives as protection for her was essential. Yājñavalkya has not advocated the practice of Satī. The tonsure and red clothes are not even hinted at either by Manu or by Yājñavalkya. Nor does either of them state that the widow is inauspicious. The widow was given a proprietory right by Yājñavalkya and that might have given rise to the practice of Satī.

Proprietory Rights of Women

Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism arose as neo-Brahmanical sects to combat Buddhism and Jainism. The Sūtras could not probably fulfil the social requirements and to build up a social and legal line of defence, hence the Smṛti code of Manu came to be compiled. A women was gradually looked upon as a slave, incapable of holding any property, but Smṛti writers could not support and fortify this position with the fear of women in the Aryan society taking the first chance to embrace Buddhism. On this background Manu comes forth to assure women a respectable position in the household and consequently in the society. Manu denounces the custom of taking bride price. He considers it to be the sale of a girl and calls the father a sinner. (*Manu* III.51). He considers that living on woman's property is also a sin. He enjoins upon a king to punish those who misappropriate the woman's property. Manu restricts woman's liberty, but it could be justified on the ground that his emphasis is on her protection (*Manu* V.147). In Manu's time women were uneducated and were married at an early age. Their judgements were likely to be wrong and hence this recommendation. This by no means is a mandatory direction. In different phases of her life, she was entrusted to a male member in the house. " Father protects (her) in child-hood, husband protects (her) in youth, and sons protect (her) in old age, a woman is never fit for independence. (*Manu* IX.3) ". The above verse is always quoted to show that Manu is against woman's freedom, he is a woman-hater. But if the context is taken into consideration, it will be seen that his emphasis is on protection of a woman and not on curtailing the freedom of a woman. According to Vijñāneśvara also a woman could hold property and her being bracketed with slaves shows her dependence on the male members of the family. In fact Manu wants women to do their household duties and live a cheerful life. (*Manu.* V.150).

The property of the mother goes to the unmarried daughters. Manu in his definition of *strīdhana* gives six sources of *stridhana.* This *strīdhana* goes to her children though the husband outlives her. The principle of co-ownership of property is not applicable to *stīdhana.* Whatever ornaments the woman wears in her life time belong to her though they are not gifted to her. The woman was allowed to collect and spend wealth for the household and sacrifices but Manu advised her to refrain from hoarding the wealth. She should not treat any family property as her own property. She was expected to behave as a trustee. Manu's predecessors have also recognised the right of *strīdhana* but it was Manu who elaborately defined it ; and gave legal recognition of holding a property to women. Yājñavalkya not only recognised *strīdhana* but also gave right of inheritance to women. (*Yaj.* II.135, 136).

The immovable property was not included in woman's property at the time of Manu, with the fear that a girl may take away the immovable property to a stranger by her marriage. To keep the immovable property of the family intact was the main motive in the patriarchal family system. Still mother and daughters were bestowed with some measure of proprietory rights to immovable property.

On the statement of Manu *viz.* " Whatever the wife earns belongs to her husband," the commentators leaned too heavily and tried to curtail wife's rights to husband's property, and they divided gifts in two categories. Inspite of this we can say that according to Manu all gifts received by the wife from any source become her *strīdhana.* However, Manu's sanction of *strīdhana* was too inadequate to meet the requirements of the time. Liberal rights were given to women by the Artha School and the changing social, and economic conditions made it necessary for Yājñavalakya to widen the property rights of women. The family guilds were the back-bone of the country's economic system, the women in those days took active part in such family professions. They are skilled like men and probably it was not possible to ask them to remain satisfied with the gift which they received occasionally. While writing about proprietory rights of women, politically, economically and commercially advanced society was before Yājñavalkya and he had to revise old rules of property rights about women. He allowed women to own the self acquired property, but what was most important was that he allowed women to inherit the property of a male which so far she could not do except as a mother. Yājñavalkya included woman's own earning into her *strīdhana.* She now became an absolute owner of her separate acquisition. This is a great advance in her life, for formerly what ever she earned went to her husband and thus went to the common fund of the family.

Yājñavalkya added *ādyam* to the traditional sources of *strīdhana.* Different commentators interpreted this word differently and tried to reconcile the definition of *strīdhana* with that of Manu's definition ; but while doing this they overlooked the social change that had taken place during this period. Yājñavalkya not only added one more category to *strīdhana* but also changed the description of other categories and enlarged the concept of *strīdhana.* He also added one more source *viz.* the compensation for supersession. The word *ādyam* has given a wide range of acquisition of wealth.

The compensation to a wife for supersession by second marriage of her husband or for abandonment by him is one third share in the property of her husband. (*Yāj.* I.76). In the matter of succession to *strīdhana* Yājñavalkya prefers female heirs to male heirs, while Manu mentions children. The heirs to *strīdhana* differ according to the form of marriage by which the woman is married. Property in non-Aryan forms of marriage went to the woman's parents. If the woman does not leave behind children the husband inherits the property only if they are married by approved forms. Yājñavalkya in II. 135, 136 says :" The wife and the daughters, also both parents, brothers, likewise and their sons, gentiles, cognates, a pupil and fellow students. . . . On failure of the prior among these, the next in order is indeed heir to the estate of one, who departed for heaven leaving no male issue. This rule extends to all classes."

Thus the widow and the daughter of a sonless man are recognised as heirs in preference to other relatives for the first time by the Dharmaśāstra. This rule is applicable to all the Varṇas. The rule of succession gave wife and daughter a right to inherit and own property irrespective of caste.

It seems that the people in the whole of the South were outside the pale of Aryan Social Scheme. The definition of Āryāvarta (*Manu*.II.23) makes it clear. The residents of Dakṣiṇāpatha were called Mlecchas. The Sātavāhanas were called Vṛṣalas which meant Śūdras. The Vākāṭakas who followed the Sātavāhanas were called Yavanas. (*History and Culture of Indian people*, Vol. II, XIII, pp. 191-196). Though the people from Dakṣiṇāpatha were not accepted in the Aryan fold, there were contacts between these different cultures. There was a constant trade between Āryāvarta and Dakṣiṇāpatha. The southerners were advanced in all respects but were probably striving for being included in the Āryan fold. The matriarchal system prevailing in some parts of the South was undergoing changes, still the woman's importance in the family and in the society was still there. Thus the Aryan society in the North and the Non-Aryan Society in the south were quite different so far as woman's position and her proprietory rights were concerned. And Yājñavalkya probably tried to bring about synthesis of two different cultures. The boundary of the Āryāvarta is simply mentioned by Yājñavalkya to be extending upto places wherever the black antelope roams.

V. K. Rajvade in his introduction to a Marathi poem on Shahāji has given reference to commercial as well as cultural contacts between the North and the South and states that probably parallel semi-Vedic society was following Vedic rules in South with slight variations but they did not receive the full recognition from the established Vedic society in the North. Yājñavalkya might have tried to bring together religiously and socially the societies in the North and in the South.

Through the fusion of North and South the rules like women's inheritance entered the Aryan Society in the North. Before Yājñavalkya formulated a regular law recognizing women's right to inheritance, the women in the Aryan society might have started getting proprietory rights through their relation to matriarchal society before marriage. Modern jurists like D. Henry Mayne express their admiration of the concepts evolved by Yājña-valkya at so early a stage in history, as similar concepts, so far as women's proprietory rights are concerned, evolved, in England as late as 1870 and Yājñavalkya's achievement is a point of pride of our cultural heritage. As far as Manu's code is concerned no provision is found to show that woman was prevented or debarred from spending or utilising her property. Yājñavalkya also did not put any restraints on woman's freedom to enjoy and spend her *strīdhana*. From *Manu* VIII.28 it becomes clear that the protection given to a woman extends to her property also, and in the absence of any male relation the king was supposed to protect a woman's property.

Before Yājñavalkya's time woman did not inherit immovable property except the mother. What she got was *strīdhana* and hence no liability of repaying debts of the deceased man was put on her but according to Yājñavalkya woman should pay the debts which she had agreed or contracted jointly with her husband. (*Yāj*.II.49). If the debt is contracted by the husband all alone, but for family purpose then also the wife is supposed to repay it.

In short, woman hereafter attained the status in law equal to that of man and became competent to take, earn, dispose of or acquire property as also to contract debts. Broadly speaking, the right to inheritance of a widow soon put an end to the practice of Niyoga, because only chaste and loyal wife could inherit the husband's property. The law of adoption developed. The permission of the elders in the family as in the case of Niyoga, was necessary if a widow wanted to adopt a son. The son to be adopted was required to be an issue of a near relation or a Gotraja, as Niyogin was required to be the first brother of the deceased husband or a near relation, or a Gotraja.

The father had to appoint his daughter for begetting a son for him at the time of her marriage, saying "The male child born of her shall perform my funeral rites." (*Manu* IX.130). Such a dauther was called *putrikā* and she was described as equal to a *putra* (son) for the purpose of continuing the line and for performing funeral rites. But Manu in IX.136 has dispensed with the formality of appointing a daughter as *putrikā*. Thus the daughter was only a step to bring forth a male issue to inherit grand-father's property and bestow salvation by offering funeral cakes to him after death. If a daughter was incapable of procreating a son because of barrenness or widow-hood she might loose the chance of inheriting her father's property. To avoid this *putrikā* was considered to be equal to a *putra*.

According to Yājñavalkya woman's proprietory rights were not limited, but later commentators placed limitations on her property out of fear of the property going out of the hands of the male members in the family. This later on became the accepted proposition of law and this mischief continued till it was corrected by Hindu Succession Act in 1956. The practice of Satī is an outcome of the rights of inheritance of woman. Where the propiertory rights of women were unlimited, custom of Satī became widespread as in Bengal where Dāyabhāga bestowed more liberal rights to them.

Wife, Mother and Woman in general

The woman from the highest position *viz.* that of Samrājñī came to the position of a Dāsī in the Sūtra period. At the time of *Manu*, the Aryan society was passing through difficult period. The old social structure and ideas required reformation. The rise of Buddhism and the mass-appeal of this sect had necessitated the restatement of Dharma in the new context. Manu reorganised and fortified the social structure. It was essential to make the home stable to ensure the stability of the society in general; and hence Manu gave emphasis on a tender attitude towards a daughter and a sister. As a wife or as a mother she should be treated with love, affection and respect. In this respect Yājñavalkya followed Manu.

Manu considers Gṛhasthāśrama as the most important Āśrama out of the four Āśramas. (*Manu* III.78) ; and calls a wife the home itself. A wife takes the qualities of her husband. Manu compares husband and wife to the ocean and the river respectively. The wife according to Manu (I.32) is half of the husband, since the God divided Himself into two halves, male and female—Manu asks a husband to avoid quarrels with his wife and to behave with her politely. The relations between the husband and the wife are exalted by Manu to the highest degree as he considers wife a gift given by the God. If a husband leaves for journey without making adequate provision for his wife he becomes reprehensible and is classed along with the father who fails to marry his daughter at a proper age. The husband is told to find conjugal happiness in the company of his wife alone. This and other minute instructions make it clear that Manu really realised the importance of the wife in the household and hence in the society. Yājñavalkya summarized in one verse his view about respectiving and honouring the wife.

Manu expects from a wife complete obedience and faith towards her husband ; though he is devoid of qualities. A wife should be cheerful and economical in household expenditure. A woman should not seek separation from her husband, because a woman without protection of her husband would not be able to defend her virtue and honour in this world, which is so full of evil things (*Manu* V.150). Manu, hence, states that a woman must never be independent. (*Manu* V.148). Manu allows a wife to offer Bali oblations, which means that she is given an important religious duty. Such a devoted, faithful and chaste wife is cremated with holy fire of Agnihotra. Yājñavalkya advised a wife to be well versed in arts, decorate her house properly and be devoted to the husband. She is supposed to worship the parents in-law. If the husband is away the wife should abstain from playing, beautifying her body, and joining festivals. The cremation with holy fire is a previlege of a chaste devoted wife from the same Varṇa as of her husband but she should be his first wife.

Manu allows two types of wives to be superseded. One who is adicted to liquor, diseased and devoid of virtues and the other is one who is barren or whose children die early or are only females, but in such cases also the husband is required to wait at least for eight years. The superseded wife was not driven away from the family. Yājñavalkya has also permitted the supersession under the same circumstances (*Yāj.* I.73). If the wife is superseded without the legally approved reasons then $\frac{1}{3}$ share of the property should be given to her (*Yaj.* I.76).

The wife was considered to be a gift from the god and the husband was not allowed to cast her off except for very serious reasons. (*Manu* VIII.389). Both Manu and Yājñavalkya strongly condemned unchastity on the part of a wife, still both of them have given opportunities for rectification in future for defaulting wives. Manu prescribes penance for such ladies and not casting off by the husband. Yājñavalkya asks the people to treat an unchaste wife with humiliation. (*Yaj.* I.70). The woman who does not conceive as a result of adulterous sexual act, is considered to have become pure after she goes through her next menstrual course and she may be abandoned only if she conceives as a result of such adulterous intercourse.

Manu declares the mother to be thousand times more honoured than the father. According to Manu the trouble which mother takes at the birth of child cannot be compensated in hundred years. Manu has equated father, mother and Guru with the three worlds. In short, both Manu and Yājñavalkya give the highest regard to a mother. Serving the mother is more than performing a sacrifice. Yājñavalkya even gives equal share to a mother along with her sons after her husband's death. Manu has prescribed severe punishment for a woman for having adulterous relations with a Śūdra. Manu does not allow a woman to be a witness.

In short Manu embraced no concepts which were unknown to the traditional Vedic thought, but he re-oriented and rejuvenated the ideas and institutions that had fallen into background as a result of the non-Aryan influence. Manu condemned the non-Āryan institutions which had taken root in the society and which were directly and indirectly responsible for reducing womanhood to the state of slavery. This process was continued by Yājñavalkya and thus both of them aimed at preserving Vedic religion from the challenge of heterodox sects. Yājñavalkya has to his credit the important achievement of bringing under the banner of a single socio-religious legal system, several people with varied customs and cultures coming from various parts of this vast sub-continent. *Manusmṛti* fortified the Vedic Aryan institutions in the society and *Yajñavalkyasmṛti* spread their influence over large parts of the country. Thus the work of Yājñavalkya supplimented the efforts of Manu.

STUDIES IN RECENSIONS AND VERSIONS OF THE MAHĀBHĀRATA*

C. R. DESHPANDE

BY publishing the critical edition of the *Mahābhārata* (MBh) the BOR Institute has placed in the hands of the discerning reader most of the MBh tradition in a systematic manner. One can methodically study this valuable material and note how various facets of the MBh Tradition have taken shape. At the same time it is possible to insolate contributions made by various provinces of India and this on its part throws light on the cultural background of those provinces. The MBh Tradition is mainly divided into Northern and Southern Recensions the former being subdivided into Śāradā, Kashmiri, Nepali, Maithili, Bengali and Devanagari versions and the latter into Telugu, Grantha and Malayalam Versions.

A close study of these Recensions and Versions reveals that the nucleus of the Epic, the Kaurava-Pāṇḍava story is the same in all versions. The material available does not give any support to the theory that a pro-Kaurava epic was later turned into a pro-Pāṇḍava one. Admiration for heores like Duryodhana[1] and Karṇa[2] is found but then similar admiration for Bhīma[3] and Arjuna[4] also is there.

Additions have been made to explain away some moral lapses on the part of the heores or to introduce the Kṛṣṇa element or for some such purpose, *e.g.*, Draupadī's polyandrous marriage has a silly justification in the Constituted Text but, the Southern redactors add seven more.[5]

---

*Work done as a Visiting Fellow of the Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Simla. Published by the Institute, under the title "*Transmission of the Mahābhāarata Tradition*", 1976.

[1] IX 201*B 1.2.5. Dn D1.5.10.

[2] VII 1 † D4.7.8. 2†Dn 914*DS 1040* K5Dn1 D5.7.

[3] VII 1408* TG2.M. 3.5. VI 365*TG 366*M etc.

[4] IV 46†S.

[5] I 102†T3 G2-4.6.

Arjuna and Subhadrā episode is a simple affair in the Text, but the Southern redactors make it quite an affair by introducing love and elopement, taking care to add a regular marriage before the loving pair begins to live happily ever after.[6] In the Text there is no love between Arjuna and Subhadrā. Arjuna is fascinated by her and on the advice of Kṛṣṇa simply carries her away.

Instances of Parāśara and Matsyagandhā,[7] Duḥṣanta, and Śakuntalā,[8] Yayāti and Śarmiṣṭhā[9] also can be quoted where the pairs are married with the whole paraphernalia of priests, relatives, *mantras*, and gifts. The Epic frankly narrates that it was an instance of lewdness on the part of the great sage Parāśara and that only *Gāndharva* form of marriage had taken place in the case of the two remaining pairs. Arjuna and Urvaśī episode[10] in the *Āraṇyaka-parvan* has also been added by some redactor interested in emphasizing moral susceptibilities of the Epic hero.

Apart from the sexual morality, the Southerners are particular about ethics and morality in other walks of life also. The Constituted Text informs us that a tribal woman and her five sons were deliberately burnt by Bhīma in the house of wax at Vāraṇāvata to camouflage the escape of the Pāṇḍavas, but the Southerners again do not want the heroes to behave in this heartless and inhuman manner and therefore they add that these unfortunate victims were in the service of Duryodhana as his spies and they were served right.[11]

In the great battle, Arjuna cut the right hand of Bhūriśravas, a warrior on the Kaurava side, who was about to kill Sātyaki, a friend of Arjuna. Now this was against the rules of just war, and we find in the Text that Arjuna is blaming himself for this act but the Southern redactors again add five grounds on which Arjuna is justified in his behaviour.[12]

Attempts have been made to introduce the Kṛṣṇa element in the epic by some versions like Nīlakaṇṭha's Devanāgarī, Devanāgarī Composite and the entire Southern Recension. While the mostdisgraceful act of disrobing Draupadī was being attempted, the Constituted Text describes, garment after garment appeared inthe place of those snatched away but we find noe xplanation of the miracle there. But Nīlakaṇṭha's Devanāgarī version and most manuscripts of the Southern Recension state that she appealed to Kṛṣṇa and that He rescued her in the shameful situation.[13] Other versions like Kashmiri 2, 4 Devanāgarī Composite Bengali and some manuscripts of the Maithili, Grantha, and Telugu versions say that hundreds of garments appeared because of the observance of *Dharma*.[14]

---

[6] I 113†D4 (marg. sec. m) S 114†D4 (marg. sec. m) S 115† K4 (marg. sec. m) D4S.
[7] I 36†D3T2G (except G6).
[8] I 610*D4.
[9] I 807*S.
[10] III 6†K2. 4BDc Dn D1-6- S.
[11] I 1474*S.
[12] VII 13†Dn1 D2.3.5.6.S.

The Durvāsas episode is found only in some manuscripts of Chaturbhuja's Devanāgarī, Nīlakaṇṭha's Devanāgarī, Devanāgarī Composite and Grantha versions only.[15]

Kṛṣṇa's rescue of Draupadī on the occasion of her attempted disrobing and his help to the Pāṇḍavas when Durvāsas came to test them, are two very popular themes in the devotional literature of Kṛṣṇa cult and many touching references to these are found in literatures of all the Modern Indian languages but they prove to be interpolations on incontrovertible manuscript evidence.

Some other incidents in which Kṛṣṇa is represented as a trickster are also later additions, *e.g.* Kṛṣṇa breaking a blade of grass and throwing the pieces in opposite directions in order to suggest to Bhīma what he should do with the pieces of Jarāsandha[16] or covering the sun with his miraculous power[17] or with the discus.[18]

The Southern Recension interpolates a long passage of 1612 lines which describes the divinity of Kṛṣṇa, his *avatāras*, his exploits in the *Sabhāparvan* which itself runs into 4780 lines all told.[19] The same recension also interpolates a passage of 3447 lines expounding *Vaiṣṇavadharma* and glorifying Ksṛṣṇa in the *Aśvamedhaparvan* itself comprising of some 5700 lines.[20]

13. II 543*Dn D1 (marg.) 4.5 (marg. sec. m) 547*S (except G1 M2).
14. II 553*K2. 4V1 BDT1 G5 (Cn glosses).
15. III 25*Dc1 Dn D1.2.3. G3.
16. II 253* DN2 D4.8. G3.
17. VII 1009*S.
18. VII 1009*TG2.5 (add).
19. II 21†S.
20. XIV 4†TGM2-4.

पुस्तकालय
87319

So on the whole Southerners appear to be more interested in enhancing the importance of Kṛṣṇa in the epic which already has given more than a fair share to that popular figure.

On the contrary, we find references to Goddess Durgā only in some manuscripts of the Northern versions—Bengali and Devanāgarī.[21] Considering the popularity of Durgā in Bengal, it is not surprising. Neither the Southern Recension nor the other versions of the Northern Recension except Kashmiri 2, Devanāgarī Composite and Nīlakaṇṭha's Devanāgarī nor the Constituted Text mention Durgā. The Gaṇeśa episode has been put at the beginning by Ratnagarbha's Devanāgarī and Kashmiri 4.6 only.[22]

Though both the recensions sing the glory of Śiva, it is more emphasized by the Northerners.[23] The Southerners go to the length of granting him equal status with Viṣṇu-Kṛṣṇa.[24] Though in the Constituted Text we find Kṛṣṇa worshiping Śiva in order to obtain a son, the whole episode seems to be hanging loose without any organic relation with the whole epic.[25]

The Southerners together with the Kashmiris introduce the poison episode which brings Śiva into prominence, but while the Southerners are content with Śiva drinking the poison to save the universe,[26] the Kashmiris enjoy a dig at the cost of Viṣṇu whom they describe as having been made black by the terrible poison.[27]

In the Constituted Text we find no poison episode but only sparks of fire flying all round from the mouth the Vāsuki. These also cause havoc but Indra showers rains and everything cools down.[28]

Sometimes the Southern Recension appears to be preserving very old traditions, much older than those in the Northern Recension or the Constituted Text. Cows are held in high reverence in

[21] IV 4†D2.3.5.6.7.9, 11, 12, Dn. VI 1 † K2.4BDa Dn D2.4.7.8.

[22] I 1†fn pp. 884-85.

[23] XIII 73*N 94*V1 B Dn D5.8 113*N.

[24] XII 5†T2 VII 1440* ŚK (K5 missing) BDc1 Dn D1-3.5.

[25] XIII 14-18.

[26] I 9†S (except M1).

[27] I 10†K4.

[28] I 16, 15-24.

R
891.2
DES-H

the *Mahābhārata.* Chapters after chapters are devoted to the description of the glory of cows in extravagant terms. Slaughter of cows is simply unthinkable in such a context, but the Southern Recension mentions it on such a large scale that a big river of fat and blood begins to flow from the piled up hides and this slaughter is not carried on by any *Rākṣasas* or *Yavanas* but by a pious king Rantideva in a sacrificial session. King Rantideva does not suffer for this in the other world but goes to heaven and becomes a friend of Indra.[29]

Turning to the principles about the ordering of society we find again a sharp difference between the Northern and Southern redactors.

The attitude of the Constituted Text towards the *Varṇa* system is a mixed one, *e.g.* Yudhiṣṭhira in the *Āraṇyakaparvan* plays down the importance of birth and sets more value on qualities. " Whoever possesses character is a Brahmin, "[30] says he. At the same time there are other views in the *Mahābhārata* itself which maintain that one's *Varṇa* depends entirely upon birth and cannot be changed in this very existence.[31]

The Southern Recension wants to emphasize this point and also to claim more and more privileges for the Brahmins. Even in passages glorifying Lord Kṛṣṇa, the Southerners do not forget to place Brahmins above Him saying that even He owes His eminent status to the favour of Brahmins.[32] Brahmins are placed outside the pale of secular power so much so that a king is not allowed to punish Brahmins even for grave offences. He can at the most only get angry with them at times.[33]

In fairness to the Southerners, it must be pointed out that they have imposed certain restrictions on Brahmins, *e.g.*, that they will be sinning if they wear sandals,[34] that they lose their Brahminhood if they live under royal patronage for a period of twelve years

29. XIII 9†D10 Scv.
30. XIII 131. 47-50.
31. XII 28-30.
32. XIII 1†D10S cv.
33. XIII 15†D10 S cv ; LL 1309 and 1317.
34. XIV 4†TG M2-4 lines 2791-92.

or more or if they stay in a town for a similar period.[35] It is also admitted that administering a Kingdom is not a job for Brahmins. The experiment was tried once with disastrous results.[36]

The Northern redactors are not particular about emphasizing rights and privileges of Brāhmaṇas, obviously satisfying themselves with whatever concessions the Epic offered. On the contrary they point out that Brahmins are brave only in words and Kṣatriyas in deeds.[37] They hold that abundance of wealth is a calamity for Brahmins and consequently for the world, for if Brahmins are very rich they will desist from observance of *Dharma* and that will spell ruin for the world. So they should be kept at subsistence level only.[38]

If from the privileged class we turn to the depressed one, we find that the Śūdra is labouring under many hardships and the Southern redactors add many more to them so much so that a Śūdra is not allowed to drink the milk of a brown cow. If he violates this injunction, not only he, but also his ancestors go to hell and even a Brahmin accepting gifts from such a Śūdra incurs terrible sin.[39]

However, these same people sometimes wax liberal and hold that devotees of Kṛṣṇa though Śūdras or Cāṇḍālas must not be insulted, (one who insults them goes to hell)[40] that even if a Śūdra makes any offering, however humble, to Kṛṣṇa, He holds it on His head,[41] that a Śūdra with good behaviour and self-control should be as much respected as a Brahmin.[42]

The Northerners again do not show any interest in adding to the sufferings of the Śūdras. The Bengali redactors allow Śūdras to observe all religious rites.[43] A Śūdra with abundant of wealth is mentioned by the Epic.

---

35. ibid, LL 3290-3303.
36. XII 111†D7S.
37. IV 42†D7.
38. XIII 337†N/LL 2-5.
39. XIII 15†D10S.
40. XIV 4†TG M2-4 LL 3254-57.
41. ibid. LL 3262-63 and 3350-51.
42. XIII 15†D10S.
43. XII 692*V1B Dn D 2, 4-9.

Real sharp difference of opinion comes out if we turn to the present over-privileged class, *i.e.*, the fair sex. Southern redactors want to discipline them and keep them in their proper place. They go to the length of saying that if a man has one thousand tongues, he lives for a hundred years and does nothing except describing the faults of woman, he will die without finishing his job.[44] They are clear in their minds that creator created women for the sake of sons and for the pleasure of the husband.[45] No woman can have a place in heaven, without a husband and a child.[46] A woman is to have one husband and a man many wives ; this is the *Dharma* ordained by *Pitṛs*.[47]

A story is told of two women, one devoted to her husband and the other worshipper of gods. After death the husband-worshipper went to a higher heaven but the god-worshipper to an inferior one.[48]

Though some manuscripts from some Northern versions insist that a husband should be properly respected and cared for,[49] the Northern redactors alone sing the greatness of a wife. I have not come across a single Southern redactor joining them. Even among the Northerners, it is the Bengali redactors that are unanimously eloquent in glorifying a wife. They hold that a house though full of sons, grandsons and daughters-in-law is desolate for a householder without a wife.[50] Like King Louis of France exclaiming " *L'etat ? C'est moi*!" these redactors claim, " *La maison ? C'est la femme*!" literally. A wife is the home in fact. A house without a wife is worse than a forest, so a widower had better go to the forest.[51] Even roots of trees are like a home in the company of a wife and a palace is a forest without her. An agreeable wife is real wealth. Wealth is no wealth at all.[52]

---

[44] XIII 289*S.

[45] I 804*5.

[46] ibid.

[47] I 100†S D4 (Supp. foll. sec. m.) K4.

[48] XIII 15†D10S cv LL 4510-4531.

[49] XII 371*K5 Da2 Dn3 D2.3.8.

[50] XII 364*K3.5 V1B.

[51] ibid.

[52] XII 366*K3.5 V1 B Da Dn1.3.

Why should there be such a sharp difference between the attitudes of the Southerners and the Northerners on this point? Could it be because of the Śakti cult prevalent in North in which prominence is given to woman as representing the mother Goddess? This may perhaps explain why Bengali redactors are so eloquent in glorification of woman though in the capacity of a wife.

With all their uncharitable attiude towards the fair sex, the Southerners must be given their due in one respect, *viz.*, their attitude towards molested women. The action taken by the idol of India, Rāma, against his innocent wife is too notorious to be stated here in detail. The Southern redactors give liberal concessions not only to unfortunate women but also to confirmed adulteresses. They hold the view that women are automatically purified every month.[53] A man abandoning his wife for any reason whatsoever incurs the sin of infanticide.[54] No man should abuse or harass or kill a woman if he wishes well to himself.[55] If a woman commits adultery the blame for the crime is put at the door of the male concerned.[56]

Even in the case of girls going astray before marriage, the Southerners take a liberal view and prescribe only three-fourths of the purificatory rites for a Brahmanicide, the remaining one-fourth is supposed to have been performed after child birth.[57] Sons of such mothers born before wedlock were called, *Kānīna* sons, they were fully authorized to make offerings to gods and manes, *i.e.*, they were completely accepted in the society.

Southerners also treat child widows leniently. A girl in whose case, the marriage ceremony was performed (but the marriage had not been consummated) could marry again after her husband dies. She was called *Punarbhū* but was not disqualified otherwise in any respect.[58]

[53] XIII 17A†D10S cv. D2-5.8.

[54] ibid.

[55] XIII 7A†D10S cv.

[56] ibid.

[57] XIII 7A†D10S cv.

[58] ibid.

However, the law-giver from South modifies this liberal stand and goes on to say, "Husband and wife can separate from each other without incurring sin for the goal of *Mokṣa.* A husband can also abandon a wife who is attached to someone else apart from adultery committed only once, whose children die, who commits adultery with a Śūdra, a confirmed adulteness but he must first make sure of his wife's guilt."[59] A husband can also abandon a wife who is self-willed, acts as she pleases, who is sterile or gives birth only to daughters or whose children die young.[60]

The Northerners also speak in very strong terms about persons abandoning their wives. Some Kashmiri manuscripts say that such a man wanders on the earth, hungry, bereft of piety, prosperity, and pleasure, begging and dressed in tattered clothes. One Devanagari manuscript also lays down that such a man incurs sin beyond expiation.[61] It will be interesting to note that the $\bar{A}_1$*.D.S.* prescribes a very hard penance for one who forsakes his wife. It orders such a person to put on the hide of an ass, with its hairy side turned outside and to beg alms from seven houses everyday with the words "Give alms to him who forsook his wife." He is to do this for six months.

The only case in the *Mahābhārata* of a person abandoning a woman because somebody else carried her away though against her will, is that of Śālva. His behaviour in this context is referred to with disapproval by the Epic.[62]

In their attitudes towards royalty also the Southerners and the Northerners differ sharply.

The Southerners consider kingship so sinful and wicked that they equate a king to ten prostitutes put together or to a butcher who is conducting ten thousand butcheries.[63] On the other hand the Northerners look upon a king as being equal to ten *Śrotriyas* put together.[64] The Śāradā and Kashmiri manuscripts make

---

[59] ibid

[60] ibid

[61] I 27† Ko. 4 Dal.

[62] V 172.

[63] XIII 423*D10 TG.

[64] I 402*K3.4 N͂VI BD T1G.

Bhīṣma say that the king is the greatest deity so that his whims should be pampered.[65] Northern redactors with those from Tamilnadu are agreed in holding that the king is at the root of the smooth working of the universe. They cannot bear to think of anarchy.[66]

On the contrary the Southerners are stern in their stand towards a king. Kingship is, they say, the fruit of great austerities. So a king should be careful. He must discipline himself first, then his servants and the subjects last.[67] He must conduct his administration in keeping with rules of political science, without hatred towards anybody.[68] He must not listen to the advice of women, foolish persons or persons with perverse minds.

The Southerners also uphold the rights of the subjects and insist on the duties of kings. They maintain that if a king fails to protect the distressed and especially ladies in difficulties and does not bring the culprits to book, he does not deserve to be a king.[69] Northerners forbid a king to take away wealth from old people, minors, blind or miserable people or from weeping ladies even for performing sacrifices.[70]

So the Northerners are cavaliers and the Southerners are roundheads in their attitudes towards royalty. Could it be that the concept of god-kings as found in the deification of Rāma and Kṛṣṇa in the North is responsible for the Northerners being so much royalistic ? It is true that by the time the redactors we are studying were active, Rāma and Kṛṣṇa had reached the South also and as we have seen, the Southerners were greater devotees of Kṛṣṇa than the Northerners, but Rāma and Kṛṣṇa reached the South after being identified with the Supreme God and perhaps faint memories of the process of defication of these kings were still lingering in the subconscious mind of the North.

65. VI 204 SKo-2.
66. I 402* K.3 4ÑV1 BDT1 G.
67. XIII 15† D10 Scv LL 876-895.
68. ibid, LL 1001-15.
69. 69. IV 329*TG2.
70. XIII 337*N.

Northerners do not seem to have been very much attached to wealth. They stress the point that wealth is not all in all. It is complacency that matters. Better not to desire for wealth at all. "Wealth obtained should be given away and not enjoyed or wasted. And after all, sages have gone to heaven even without wealth ".[71]

The Southerners on the other hand seem to be more practical. They maintain that wealth has held the world together, so one must appreciate wealth.[72]

Wealth is exhausted by lapse of good luck and not by enjoyment, so one should enjoy wealth as much as possible.[73] Moneyed people can get out of difficulties. A person without money has no place either in this world or in the next.[74] So the Southern redactors take care to advise how best one can utilize one's income. They advise that 25% of the income should be spent for religious purposes, 25% for maintaining oneself, 25% should be invested for improving one's prospects, and 25% should be saved for the rainy day.[75]

The same practical attitude of the Southerners is noticed in the treatment of *Ahiṁsā*. *Ahiṁsā* is raised to the skies in all religious literature including the *Mahābhārata* though in the latter impossibility of observing total *Ahiṁsā* is also pointed out in many places. Some Devanāgarī manuscripts join in the glorification of *Ahiṁsā* and declare that just as in the foot of an elephant, feet of all other animals are covered, so in *Ahiṁsā* all piousness is contained.[76]

[71] XII 4†N (except D7).

[72] XII 203* D7S.

[73] XIII 610*S.

[74] XIII 15†D10S cv LL 1469-70.

[75] ibid., LL 1441-1467.

[76] XIII 20†D4-8.

The Southern redactors take care to pay lip homage to *Ahiṁsā* and say that all pious acts put together are not equal to even one-sixteenth part of *Ahiṁsā*,[77] but the same passage in the same manuscript takes care to point out that it is next to impossible to observe *Ahiṁsā* completely since the whole universe is full of beings large and small, visible and invisible, and that even foodgrains have life. The nature of every activity is determined by the mind behind it, so one should not mind *Hiṁsā* when it is unavoidable.[78]

It is next pointed out by the same redactor that Brahmins refusing to perform Vedic sacrifices, and soldiers refusing to fight because their activities involve *Hiṁsā* will positively incur sin and go to hell.[79]

The Southern redactors are greater lovers of details with or without rhyme and reason, *e.g.*, they make Draupadī almost give herself out by declaring to the queen of Virāṭa that she was seized by hair even in the presence of her husbands (plural) and that she had afterwards to sustain herself by fruits, roots, etc. in a forest for twelve years without any house to stay in.[80] Now she is showing this indiscretion when the Pāṇḍavas are supposed to stay incognito for one year !

In course of such descriptions they do not fight shy of introducing erotic element often bordering on obscenity.[81] Sometimes they introduce humorous touches, *e.g.*, Morsels of food in Bhīma's belly become one mass by the blows of Baka on his back, yet Bhīma decides to finish the food off before engaging Baka in combat, because after the fight, he is sure that he will not be able to eat the food since by that time he would have touched the corpse of Baka.[82]

77. XIII 15†D10 S ev LL 1228-32.
78. ibid,. LL 1095-1105.
79. ibid., LL 2697-98 and 1203-5.
80. IV 208*S.
81. I 89†D5S, I 1333*G1 1335*G1, etc.
82. I 1649*G 1.2.4.

Two Telugu and Grantha manuscripts point out that when a wife with one husband has to lead a miserable life, Draupadī with five husbands has no limit to her share.[83]

The Northerners are also not averse to humour, *e.g.*, some Kashmiri and Devanāgarī Composite manuscripts describe that Arjuna buries an arrow into the head of Bhīṣma and loudly asks the Kauravas to mark the wonderful horn of the old man that he secured for the sake of his grand children.[84]

The Northerners also add details without any conceivable reason, *e.g.*, some Bengali and Devanāgarī versions add to the already tedious commentary of Sañjaya on the great war a passage in 339 lines in which Śveta a warrior on Pāṇḍava side, attacks Śalya on Kaurava side and it is only after the Kaurava commander-in-chief, Bhīṣma gives a tough fight, that he is killed at last. I do not know if there was any king by name Śveta in these provinces whom the poetasters wanted to figure in the great war.[85]

To sum up, a study of the interpolated material to the *Mahābhārata* provides some interesting information about the regional cultural patterns of various regions of India that have contributed something to the *Mahābhārata* corpus. To find out why these regions should represent the particular cultural patterns will be a very interesting enquiry which can perhaps be best handled by sociologists and historians specializing in the various regional cultures.

If more frequent references have been made to Southern redactors it is only because they have a recension of about 99,000 verses against that of about 83,000 verses of the Northern ones. The Critical Edition has arrived at the Constituted Text running into about 73,000 verses, so the contribution of the Southerners comes to about 26,000 verses as against that of the Northerners which is about 10,000 verses only.

---

83. IV 386*T2G2.
84. IV 1028*K2 D1.2.4.5.9 and IV 1029*D4.
85. VI 4†B 3.4, D4.5 Dn M.3-5.

ABBREVIATIONS

Add	adding
BOM	Bombay Edition of the Mahābhārata (Śaka 1799)
B	Bengali Version
Ca	Arjunamiśra's Commentary
Cb	Vimalabodha's Commentary
Cd	Devabodha's Commentary
Cn	Nīlakaṇṭha's Commentary
Cv	Vāḍirāja's Commentary
D	Devanāgarī Composite Version
Dc	Caturbhuja's Devanāgarī Version
Dn	Nīlakaṇṭha's Devanāgarī Version
Dr	Ratnagarbha's Devanāgarī Version
Ds	Sarvajña Nārāyaṇa's Devanāgarī Version
G	Grantha Version
inf. lin	infra linean (below the line)
ins.	insert(s)
K	Kashmiri Version
Kum. Kumbh	Kumbhakonam Edition of the Mahābhārata
M	Malayalam Version
marg	marginal (ly)
MBh (C)	Mahābhārata—C. Rajgopalachari Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 7th Edition 1962.
MBh (D)	Mahābhārata Condensed into English Verse Ma Romesh Chandra Dutt, Kitabistan, Allahabad 1944.
MBh (R)	Mahābhārata : Analysis and Index, E. P. Rice, Oxford 1934.
Meaning	On the Meaning of the Mahābhārata—V. S. Sukthankar, Asiatic Society of Bombay, 1957.

N	Nepali Version
N	Northern Version
Om	Omit(s), omitting
Pr. m.	propria manu (by own hand)
Ś	Śāradā Version
S	Southern Recension
Sec. m.	Secunda manu (by another hand)
sup. lin	supra lineam (above the line)
supp	supplementary
T	Telugu Version
V	Maithili Version

SIGNIFICANCE OF VYĀGHRA—SMṚTI IN DHARMA-ŚĀSTRA*

S. G. MOGHE

THE present paper deals with the contribution of Vyāghra to some of the concepts and aspects of the Dharma-Śāstra and the arrangement that is assigned to some of his stanzas in the later Dharma-Śāstra literature by the commentators of the Smṛtis and digest authors. The stanzas are quoted from my critical edition of the *Vyāghra-Smṛti* being published by BORI, Poona.

I. In the Dharma-Śāstra literature, it is a well-known fact that a Śūdra is not entitled to have any right to perform the Śrāddha ceremony of his dead ancestors. MM. Dr. P. V. Kane in his *History of Dharma-Śāstra* Vol. IV, p. 365, has quoted the text of the *Smṛtyarthasāra* to show that a Śūdra should get the Śrāddha performed through a priest or priests or they may perform it for him without uttering mantras. The *Vyāghra smṛti*[1] on the other hand allows a person from a Śūdra community to perform a Śrāddha without having a Tilak mark on the forehead. If, however, he applies a Tilak mark on the forehead, his dead ancestors get disappointed and this kind of Śrāddha does not bring him any glorious fruit as such. Moreover, this kind of Śrāddha is not received by the dead ancestors. Now the question arises as to what kind of Śūdra is qualified to perform a Śrāddha according to Vyāghra. This question is solved by Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa in his *Smṛti-Candrikā*,[2] Śrāddha Kāṇḍa, by quoting a stanza in the name of Vyāghra. This stanza simply means that a Śūdra who is born as a result of the union of a Brahmin husband and a consecrated Śūdra wife and who is more engaged in his own work is regarded as a good Śūdra or a competent Śūdra, in the opinion of Vyāghra, to perform a Śrāddha ceremony. The stanza quoted by the author of the *Smṛti-Candrikā* is also found in the *Smṛtimuktāphalaṁ*, Śrāddhakāṇḍa Page 667. From this , it goes without saying that in the vast Dharma-Śāstra literature, Vyāghra has expressed a revolutionary view allowing a particular Śūdra to perform a Śrāddha without a Tilak mark.

---

*Work done as post-Doctorate research in 1978-79.

[1] *Śrāddham kuryāttu śūdro'pi śūnyam kuryāllalāṭakam|*
*lalāṭe tilakaṁ dṛṣṭvā nirāśāḥ pitaro gatāḥ||*Vyāghra st. 28.

[2] *Saṁskṛtāyām tu śūdrāyāṁ brahmabījasamudbhavaḥ|*
Ṣvakarmaniratāścaiva sacchūdraḥ saṁprakīrtitaḥ|| Smṛti-Candrikā-
Śrāddha kāṇḍa p. 417.

II. Vyāghra also appears to have attached supreme importance to the custom which is even to-day recognised as a valid source of Hindu law even during the British regime and even after the dawn of independence. Vyāghra,[3] for example, points out that in some parts of India like Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kaliṅga, Tailaṅga, and Draviḍa, there is no practice of applying a Tilak mark on the forehead. Vyāghra has further emphasised the importance of a tilak mark on the forehead for all the matters pertaining to Śrāddha, Ācamana, Sandhyākarma and others. In the *History of Dharma-Śāstra*, , Vol. II, Part I, pp. 585, 672-675, Dr. Kane has not mentioned this peculiar custom of not applying a Tilak mark on the forehead. In the article on 'Tilak Mark' contributed to *Ṛṣi-Kalpanyāsa—Paṇḍita Rājeshvarashāstri Dravid felicitation volume*,[4] he remarks that the application of a Tilak mark on the forehead of the ladies does not appear to be obligatory on them. It is difficult to agree with the learned Doctor on this point. One can quote here the stanza from the *Vyāghra Śmṛti*[5] which clearly means that a Brahmin without a Tilak mark on his forehead and a pious lady without having the Tilak mark of saffron on her forehead—these two things are condemned among the people and particularly in respect of the matters pertaining to *daiva* and *pitrya*.

III. Vyāghra's original contribution to the correct understanding of the concept of the term 'Svayaṁpāka' in the field of Dharma-Śāstra is really supreme. Vyāghra, for example, explains it by saying[6] that when the food for the Śrāddha ceremony is cooked either by the Yajamāna himself or by his wife or by his son, then that cooked food is called as Svayaṁpāka. He further indicates[7] that the food prepared by the Yajamāna himself is pure and possibly the preference is to be given to it over the food prepared by other members of the family *i.e.*, by his wife or by a son. In the *Yājñavalkya-Smṛti* and even in the *Manu-Smṛti*, this concept of Svayaṁpāka is not clarified to the readers. Hence the importance of the *Vyāghra Smṛti* can hardly be denied in correctly understanding this concept. Vyāghra has also given a warning in respect of the food not to be cooked by some members of the family. Vyāghra, for example, points out[8] that the food for the Śrāddha ceremony is not to be cooked by a daughter, a widow, a childless woman, a pregnant woman and a woman with bad appearance. The gods and dead ancestors are not satisfied by the food that is cooked by these members so specified by Vyāghra. It may be significantly pointed out that in the ancient smṛti works, we do not have any information regarding the food not to be cooked by some members of the family—particularly for the Śrāddha ceremony. Hence this significant aspect of the *Vyāghra Smṛti* in respect of Svayaṁpāka and the persons disqualified for cooking the Śrāddha food can hardly be ignored. In passing, it may be added that even in the *History of Dharma-Śāstra*, MM. Dr. P. V. Kane has not touched this aspect.

---

[3] *Aṅgavaṅgakalingāśca tailaṅgā drāviḍāstathā|*
Sadā śūnyamukhā jñeyā deśadharmānusārataḥ|| Vyārghra-Smṛti St. 32.

[4] *Ṛṣi-Kalpanyāsa*—pp. 287-292.Allahabad 1971.

[5] *Tilakena vinā vipro puṇyastrī kuṁkumaṁ vinā|*
Dvāvetau garhitau loke daive pitrye ca karmaṇi|| Vyāghra Smṛtī. St. 192.

[6] *Svayaṁ vā pacyate pākaḥ patnī vā pacyate yadi|*
putreṇa pacyate pākaḥ svayaṁpākaḥ sa ucyate|| Vyāghra-Smṛti. St. 217.

IV. The question often arises in respect of the Śrāddha of a person whose death anniversary is not known. In this respect, Vyāghra has an original view to offer. He points out[9] that when the death anniversary of a person is not known, one may perform the Śrāddha of a person on the eleventh day of the black fortnight of that month. The view point of Marīci quoted by Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa[10] in his *Smṛti-Candrikā* Śrāddhakāṇḍa comes very near to the view point of Vyāghra, though the difference in the language of both of them is always to be taken for granted.

---

[7] *Ātmapākaṁ pavitraṁ ca vyāghrasya vacanaṁ yathā|*
Vyāghra-Smṛti St. 218b.

[8] *Na kanyā kriyate pākaṁ* na *pākaṁ cānyagotrajāḥ|*
Vidhavā ca *tathā vandhyā garbhastrī yā ca durmukhī||* St. 220.

[9] *Śrāddhavighnasamutpanne hyavijñāte mṛte'hani|*
Kuryādannena kṛṣṇāyāmekādaśyāṁ vidhukṣaye || St. 311.

[10] *Śrāddhavighne samutpanne avijñāte mṛte'hani|*
Ekādaśyāṁ tu kartavyaṁ kṛṣṇapakṣe viśeṣataḥ||
Marīci quoted in the *Smṛticandtrikā-Śrāddha* Kāṇḍa p. 125 (Mysore edition).

V. The signal contribution of Vyāghra to the evolutionary aspect of Atideśa *i.e.*, a rule of Transfer should be appreciated.[11] Generally it is agreed that when the details of the Prakṛti are transferred to the Vikṛti, some kind of deduction takes place in respect of the details. Vaidyanātha Dīkṣita (1650—1700 A.D.), the author of the digest *Smṛtimuktāphalaṁ* has quoted a stanza in the the name of Vyāghra[12] which means that when the details in respect of a Vrata in a Prakṛti are transferred to the Vikṛti, the details become less by one-fourth of the original. In other words, in the opinion of Vyāghra, only the three-fourth of the details are transferred from the Prakṛti to the Vikṛti. Nīlakaṇṭha (1600—1660 A.D.) has pointed out the three varieties of Atideśa such as Sāmya, Tādrūpya and Vācanika. He has also suggested the rates of deduction[13] for these varieties. For Sāmya Atideśa, he suggests the deduction of one half of the details of the Prakṛti to the Vikṛti. In the case of Tādrūpya and Vācanika varieties of Atideśa, however, Nīlakaṇṭha suggests that the details from the Prakṛti to the Vikṛti become less by one-fourth of the original *i.e.*, the Prakṛti. Nīlakaṇṭha's varieties of Tādrūpya and Vācanika Atideśa come very near to the view point of Vyāghra quoted by the author of the *Smṛtimuktāphalam*. From this discussion, it would be quite evident that Vyāghra has contributed to the evolutionary aspect of Atideśa particularly in the matter of deduction of the details from the Prakṛti to the Vikṛti. Nīlakaṇṭha has not quoted the text of Vyāghra referred to or quoted in the *Smṛtimuktāphalam*.

VI. Some of the epigrams of Vyāghra can be traced elsewhere. Two stanzas of Vyāghra could be traced in the digest authors as ascribed to some other authors *e.g.* ' *Akāle kurute karmākāle prāpte na kārayet | kālātītaṁ tu yatkarma akṛtaṁ taṁ vinirdiśet ||* as No. 161 of my critical edition is found with slight variations quoted in the *Smṛticandrikā*, Āhnika Kāṇḍa p. 427 as ascribed to Pulastya. Another stanza No. 203 '*Gururagnirdvijātīnām* etc. from the *Vyāghra Smṛti* is found with slight variations in the *Auśanasa Smṛti* p. 505 (*The collection of the Smṛtis* by Jivananda Vidyasagara published in 1876). However, the stanza No. 358 from the *Vyāghra Smṛti* is not found anywhere quoted in the collection of the Smṛti works so far published.[14] The importance of the *Vyāghra Smṛti* even from the angle of epigrams has to be appreciated.

---

[11] I could not mention Vyāghra's view in my article on the evolution of the Mīmamsa Technical term Atideya, ABORI Vols 58-59 (Diamond jubilee no. 1977-78) pp. 777-784.

[12] *Atideśasyopadeśānnyūnatvāttadvratam na hi|*
Atidiṣṭeṣū sarvatra pādonaṁ tadvratam caret|| *Smṛtimuktāphalam* Srāddha Kāṇḍa p. 864.

[13] For Tādrūpya Atideśa—See *Prāyaścitta Mayūkha* pp. 82, 110, For Vācanika Atideśa—See *Prāyaścitta Mayūkha* pp. 176, 188 (Gujarati Printing Press, Bombay, 1940). For Sāmya Atideśa—See. *Vyavahāra Mayūkha* p. 57 (Kane's edn.)

VII. The *Vyāghra Smṛti* is important even from the point of view of Interpretation. The *Vyāghra Smṛti* has served the purpose of the commentator Maskari on the *Gautama Dharma-Sūtra* (*GDS*). He, has made profuse use of the *Vyāghra Smṛti* in interpreting the text of GDS. Maskari quotes[15] the text of Vyāghra to explain the significance of the word *ca* in GDS 23·12 (p. 318), to explain the varieties of Śrāddha on the GDS 11.9 (p. 179), material and country for the Śrāddha on the GDS 15·4 (p. 249), expiations for woman leading an immoral life on the GDS 22.8 (p. 355), expiation for a man leading an immoral life on the GDS 22.31 (pp. 359—360). All these references from the commentary of Maskari on the GDS clearly indicate the utility of Vyāghra from a different angle. These references further indicate that Vyāghra's views have become acceptable to the commentators of the Sūtra literature.

VIII. It would be interesting to see whether the view expressed by Vyāghra in the field of Dharma-Śāstra has any Vedic basis. Vyāghra has specifically stated that when the Gotra of a dead person is not known, one may utter the name of Kaśyapa. This view of Vyāghra is stated with approbation by most of the writers on Dharma-Śāstra. It is Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa (1150 to 1225 A.D.), the author of the *Smṛticandrikā* who has quoted this view of Vyāghra and supported the same by quoting the Śruti[16] passage. From this, one is justified in holding that the view point of Vyāghra has a Vedic basis.

[14] *Asantuṣṭe sukhaṁ nāsti na dharmaḥ kṣudramānase/*
Bhāgyahīne dhanaṁ nāsti nāsti puṇye cyutārcanam//—st. 358.

[15] (*i*) *Caśabda āśritādibhāryopasaṇgrahārthaḥ/Tathā ca Vyāghraḥ/* Maskari on GDS.23.12 p. 378. (Mysore Edition, 1917)
(*ii*) *Deśasya puṣkarādeḥ/Yathā'ha Vyāghraḥ/*Ibid 15-4, p. 249.

[16] *Tathā ca śrutiḥ—'Tasmādāhussarvāḥ prajāḥ kaśyapāḥ iti/ Smṛticandrikā*-Śrāddha Kāṇḍa p. 388 (Mysore edition, 1918).

IX. A curious reader of Dharma-Śāstra would be interested in knowing the position of the *Vyāghra Smṛti* particularly when it comes in direct conflict with the view point of the ancient Smṛtikāras like Manu and Yājñavalkya. Here one may quote the stanza from the *Vyāghra Smṛti*[17] quoted in the Dharma-Śāstra literature. Here the question arises as to whether a boy in whose case the intiation ceremony has taken place is entitled to perform the Śrāddha ceremony. The text of Vyāghra is quoted by Bālaṁbhaṭṭi in his commentary on the Prāyaścitta Portion of the *Mitākṣarā* on the *Yājñavalkya-Smṛti* to show that a boy in whose case the initiation ceremony or thread ceremony has taken place can perform the Śrāddha ceremony and also offer water in the honour of his dead ancestors. This view of Vyāghra comes in direct conflict with the *Manu-Smṛti* II.171—172 which allows a boy in whose case the thread ceremony has not taken place to perform the Śrāddha ceremony. In such a doubtful case, Bālaṁbhaṭṭi (1730—1830 A.D.)[18] decides that the text of Vyāghra is to be set aside and preference is to be shown to the text of the *Manu-Smṛti.* In other words, when the view point of Vyāghra comes in direct conflict with *Manu-Smṛti Bālaṁbhaṭṭi* rejects the view point of Vyāghra. Here one may point out that Vaidyanātha Dīkṣita in his *Smṛtimuktāphalaṁ*[19] quotes the view point of Devaṇṇabhaṭṭa, the author of the *Smṛticandrikā*, who holds that in such a case of conflict, one may resort to option.

X. It would be equally interesting to know the arrangement that is assigned to the text of Vyāghra in the vast Dharma Śāstra literature. Here one may quote a stanza[20] in the name of Vyāghra from the Śuddhi aspect of Dharma-Śāstra. This stanza is found quoted by Maskari in his comments on the GDS 14.28 p. 238. This stanza means that if a person of the lower caste carries the corpse of the person belonging to a higher caste or a person belonging to a higher caste carries the corpse of a person belonging to a lower caste with a seen or visible motive, then his impurity gets doubled.

---

[17] *Kṛtacūḍastu kurvīta udakaṁ piṇḍameva ca |*
Svadhākāraṁ prayuñjīta vedoccāraṁ na kārayet || Vyāghra quoted by *Bālamṁbhaṭṭi*-Prāyascitta—p. 41.

[18] *Tanmanuvirodhādupekṣyam*/Ibid. p. 41.

[19] *Etayoḥ pūrvoktamanvādi vacanānāṁ ca vikalpa iti candrikāyāmuktam*/*Smṛtimuktāphalaṁ*-Śrāddha-Kāṇḍa—p. 560.

[20] *Avaraścedvaraṁ varṇaṁ avaraṁ vā varo yadi|*
Vahecchavadāśaucaṁ dṛṣṭārthe dviguṇam bhavet || Vyāghra.

He has to observe impurity for a period which will have to be double in comparison with the ordinary period of impurity. Now it would be interesting to see how this stanza of Vyāghra is looked at by the writers on Dharma-Śāstra. (1) Haradatta[21] in his comment on the *Gautama Dharma-Sūtra* remarks that this stanza refers to the carrying of the corpse of a servant by a person belonging to a higher caste. (2) Vaidyanātha Dīkṣita in his *Smṛtimuktāphalaṁ*[22] Āśauca kaṇḍa states that this stanza refers to the occasion when there is no difficulty either for a person of a lower caste or for a person of a higher caste. (3) Maskari on the GDS 14.28 states that if the act is done either by a person of a lower caste or by a higher caste with some visible motive, then only the impurity gets doubled. He does not explain the term 'visible motive.' Is it likely that carrying of the corpse by accepting some money prohibited in the present context? (4) Nandapaṇḍita in his *Śuddhicandrikā*[23] (1580—1630 A.D.) on *Saḍaśīti* remarks that if a person or a higher caste or a lower one takes wages for carrying the corpse, then only the period of impurity will be doubled. (5) *Bālaṁbhaṭṭi* on the Prāyścitta portion of the *Mitākṣarā* on the *Yājñavalkya-Smṛti* observes that this stanza has no reference to the greedy nature, but it refers to a servant belonging to a lower caste. All these references from the commentators and digest authors are sufficient to establish my standpoint that in assigning arrangement to the text of Vyāghra, there appears to be a difference of opinion among the writers on Dharm-Śāstra.

XI. The utility of the text of Vyāghra can hardly be denied in correcting the mistake on the part the learned authority on Dharma-Śāstra like MM. Dr. P. V. Kane. In respect of sipping the water at the time of Sandhyāvandan, the learned Doctor observes[24] that the practice of uttering names of Viṣṇu at the time of Sandhyāvandana appears to be a modern one and particularly practised in the Deccan part of India. Further, this practice is not at

[21] *Atraiva bhrutyārthe vyāghraḥ|* Haradatta On GDS p. 151.

[22] *Anāpadi tu vtyāghraḥ| Smṛtimuktāphalaṁ*-Āśauca Kāṇḍa p. 545.

[23] *Dravyalobhena tu vijātīyanirharaṇe dviguṇamāśaucam| Śuddhicandrikā* p. 66 (Chowkhamba Sk. Series, 367, 1928).

[24] *History of Dharma Śāstra* Vol. II Part I. p. 315.

all advocated by any Smṛtikāra or a commentator. These remarks of the learned Doctor are serious and cannot be accepted without challenge. Here it may be respectfully submitted that Vyāghra has laid down the practice of uttering 24 names of Viṣṇu along with the nyāsas to be followed. The probable date of the *Vyāghra Smṛti* falls in the 10th century A.D. Moreover, this text of *Vyāghra* is also quoted by *Bālambhaṭṭi*[25] on the Ācāra portion of the *Mitākṣarā* on the *Yājñavalkya-Smṛti.* The verses on the name of Vyāghra are quoted by Bālambhaṭṭi from the *Prayogapārijāta.* In addition to this, he also quotes from *Agastisaṁhitā*, *Gautamatantra* and *Rāmārcana-candrikā* in support of this practice of uttering 24 names of Viṣṇu. Besides, one should note that Bālambhaṭṭi belongs to the northern part of India and is written in the latter part of the 18th century A.D. and the former part of the 19th century A.D.. The text of *Bālambhaṭṭi* is published by Mr. J. R. Gharpure in A.D. 1914 and Dr. Kane has consulted this book. One may say here that ' Even Homer sometimes nods.'

---

[25] *Bālambhaṭṭi* Ācāra p. 76.

THE CONCEPT OF RUDRA-ŚIVA IN THE LIGHT OF ITS NĀMA-LITERATURE *

VIJAYALAXMI S. NAMJOSHI

THE deity Śiva as we know today, is the deity as is depicted in our *Purāṇas*. This historic Śiva appears to be an admixture of different antagonistic traits. A casual glance at different names by which this deity is invoked, confirms this belief. This historic Śiva has definitely originated from Vedic Rudra ; rather, Śiva is but an expanded version of Rudra. The approach here is to trace this expansion through the study of the names by which, first Rudra and then Śiva came to be invoked. In the epics and the *Purāṇas*, these very names are strung together and called Sahasranāmāvalis and form a liturgical part of daily Śiva worship. It is to be accepted that the name, of a person or a deity, that is bestowed on it, bears a meaning that is closely related to the personality bearing it.

This study begins at the beginning *i.e.* from the *Ṛgveda*. One cannot go beyond the *Vedas*, there being no literary heritage dating from pre-Vedic times, even though there existed a pre-Vedic civilization. The apparent similarity between the figure on the Paśupati seal dating back to these pre-Vedic times, and the historic Śiva in his Yogī-form, has helped Śaivaites to claim theirs to be the most ancient living faith in the world.

The study here gets confined to—

(1) The hymns addressed to Rudra in the *Vedas*.

(2) The Śivasahasranāmāvali from the *Mahābhārata* ; Anuśāsana Parva.

(3) The Śivasahasranāmāvalis from the *Purāṇas* :
  (i) *Śiva Purāṇa*—Chapter 4·35
  (ii) *Saura Purāṇa*—Chapter 41
  (iii) *Liṅga Purāṇa*—Chapters 65 and 98.

---

*Submitted to the University of Bombay in 1980

This covers the Vedic, the epic as well as the Purāṇic period.

The Vedic Rudra : There is no deity as Śiva in The *Vedas*, but the continuous usage of some particular names as Rudraḥ, Kapardiḥ, Śivaḥ, Tryambakaḥ etc. show that Śiva is but an expanded version of Rudra only. The number of hymns addressed only to Rudra in the *Ṛgveda* are very few indeed as compared to other Vedic deities. This shows that Rudra was but a minor deity then. The hymns are : RV. II.33, RV. VII.46, RV. I.43 and 114. RV. VI. 74 is addressed to Rudra and Soma together. There is no Nāma literature as such here. Therefore, the attributes of the deity are to be taken into consideration. These attributes can be generally divided as showing (*a*) physical appearance ; and (2) Malign and benign nature of Rudra. The general impression gathered is that of a crude, undeveloped concept, lacking in the royal grandeur of a god-head.

He is described as tawny, bright, fair, golden, strong and at times even fierce to look at, massive and awe-inspiring. Seated in a chariot, he shoots swift arrows in all directions, eager to attack and injure even innocent souls, he takes everyone unawares. This element of surprise in the attack is so shocking that the undercurrent in these hymns is the latent dread of this fierce deity. In this capacity as the killer force, he lives up to his name Rudraḥ : *Rodayati sarvān iti Rudraḥ.* This fierce and injurious aspect of Rudra's personality has led scholars to believe in the non-Āryan origin of this concept. Whatever the opinion, it is a fact that Rudra was already accepted into the Āryan pantheon long before the Vedas were compiled.

While accepting the fierce side of Rudra's personality, one cannot afford to ignore the other side of the same deity, which depicts him as the most benign-one. He is praised as the bountiful giver of the best medicines, as the saviour offering his helping hand to the needy. What delineates Rudra from other Vedic gods is his medicine that consists of water only. He is called " Jalāśabheṣajaḥ." With other Vedic deities, he shares some attributes like Babhruḥ, Vajrahastaḥ, Kapardiḥ etc., but not Jalāśabhéṣajaḥ. This very fact determines the original concept or Rudra as the element of water. The secrete of the dual personality of Rudra-malign and benign, is to be found here.

The name Tryambakaḥ which occurs in the *Ṛgveda* also signified the association with water in the form of rain. Amba here means water (and not eye) and Tri signifies the three worlds with which rain-water comes into contact. It is a known fact that rain water, in its fierce form, is most destructive, yet in its gentle way, it contains the great medicinal value as well as the power of creation.

This dual personality of Ṛgvedic Rudra is further developed in the *Yajurveda.* There is a full chapter devoted solely to Rudra here, which is called Rudrādhyāya or Śatarudrīya. The latter name suggests the expansion of Rudra into hundred forms. This is a definite change as compared to Ṛgvedic Rudra. Rudra is here more powerful and controls more aspects of human life. This is the first adjustment the deity had to go through in order to maintain its hold on human life. During this period the Āryans had settled down to a pastoral life, the wars with the Dāsas were over, and for a happy, peaceful life, the importance of rain could not be overlooked. The attributes of Rudra here can be analysed under more categories, which show how Rudra now governed wider fields, being endowed with more power and as a result, was attributed new names :

(1) Physical appearance ;
(2) Destructive force
(3) Benign force
(4) Association with water, serpents etc.
(5) Leader of all
(6) Some specific new names.

The attributes here suggest that the concept was now completely anthropomorphised. His hands, legs, eyes etc., are mentioned along with his complexion and he is said to be draped in animal hide. While in The *Ṛgveda*, he was a sky-deity ; in the *Yajurveda*, he is said to be residing on mountains (nearer to earth). He carries a number of weapons like the bow and arrow, dagger etc., though his main weapon remains his ' anger '–manyu. As leader of his army and assemblies he is Senānām patiḥ and Gaṇapatiḥ. The widened field of his control made him the leader of everyone— high or low, robbers or artisans, urban or rural peoples, mendicants and merchants, counsellors or thieves—all strata of society came under his regime. Here, in the *Yajurveda*, his association with water is very much emphasized. He is said to be present in all forms of water, in lakes, ponds, rivers, streams, even in stagnant waterpools and eddies. He is also said to have full command over serpents. These two things water and the poisonus serpents again mark out Śiva as he is called now as the bountiful giver of life and medicines. The continuity in this aspect of the personality of Rudra and Śiva is established with this continuous association with the element of water. The origin of the association of Śiva-temples near watery spots and the presence of serpents on Śiva's body is to be traced to this.

The new names Rudra gains here are Śivaḥ, Śaṅkaraḥ, Nīlagrīvaḥ, Paśupatiḥ, Somaḥ, as also Śipiviṣtaḥ, the last one having some controversial meaning. In classical Sanskrit, it bears a bad meaning but here it need not be taken to be so. In fact the name first occurs in the *Ṛgveda* in a hymn addressed to Viṣṇu, another minor deity of the *Ṛgveda*. There also the bad meaning, associated with this word is doubted. *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* (II.2, 12, 4, 5) specify Śipi as cattle or rays and that meaning should be applied here. In the chapter, eulogizing Rudra, a derogatory meaning could not have been intended. This chapter also clearly separates the Ghora and a-Ghora sides of Rudra's personality. Yet, it is for the first time that Rudra is called Śiva and Śaṅkara. The dreaded deity is also the auspicious saviour. This change signified his ascendency to supremacy. This chapter also marks the basis for the beginning of later Nāma literature.

The *Atharvaveda* does not contribute much to this ascendency. Here Rudra is in his original crude form and without any finesses. The *Brāhmaṇas* or the *Upaniṣads* do not contribute to the Nāma literature. Only the later *Upaniṣad-Śvetāśvatara* can be termed sectarian in approach and here Śiva is called Maheśvara and his power of creation is called Prakṛti ; definitely in keeping with the popular Sāṁkhya concepts.

The Epic Period : The first proper Śivasahasranāmāvali is found in the Anuśāsana Parva of the *Mahābhārata*. On one hand this is a development on the Rudrādhyāya, while on the other it forms the basis for later *Purāṇa-nāmāvalis.* The driving force behind the creation of this literature being devotion ; it is impossible for a devotee to express the immensity of the Nameless-one in definite numbers. In this particular Nāmāvali, there are 1,008 names, which can be divided under these categories as—

(1) Physical appearance.
(2) Śiva the creator, sustainer, destroyer.
(3) Śiva the great ascetic.
(4) Śiva the formless entity.
(5) The immanent lord and Iśwara.
(6) The teacher divine.
(7) Symbol of Time and Death—Kāla.
(8) Master of all arts.
(9) The bountiful giver.
(10) The prominent deity of epic mythology.
(11) Śiva equated with other deities, and in compromising form with Viṣṇu.
(12) Liṅga worship.

The above analysis shows how epic-Śiva had grown in power and gained the all-supreme position in the Hindu pantheon. The cause for this expansion of his personality was the need to face the strong influence of Buddhist philosophy on society. The Buddhist ideal of penance and austerities was easily counter-balanced by emphasising the unusual traits found in Rudra-Śiva's personality.

In physical appearance here, his meagre belongings and the unusual dress are more emphasised which is appropriately described in his name Unmattaveśaprachhannaḥ. The presence of the Ganges in his Jaṭās is now mentioned as in his name 'Jāhnavīdhṛt.' But the most striking change is the mention of the eye on his forehead. He is Lalāṭākṣaḥ. While his two eyes look benevolently on mankind, the third eye concentrates all the anger that is latent in his personality. This, therefore, remained as the constant reminder of his power of destruction, though this destructive force was now directed only at the sinner and not also at innocent souls as earlier. This destructive force is expressed in such names as Kālaḥ, Rudraḥ and as in names that begin with the prefix Mahā as Mahānakhaḥ, Mahāghoraḥ etc..

This fierceness also alludes to his aloofness which is said to be the result of his penance and austerities. Rudra's general appearance combined with his attire, secluded abode etc. helped in coining a great ascetic out of Vedic Rudra ; and Śiva the great ascetic was born. To emphasise the realisation of the euphemeral character of life and the extreme renunciation, Śiva is now said to roam the burning grounds and gets the name Śmaśānacārī etc.. He is the Yogī, Jitendriyaḥ, Bhasmaśayaḥ, Mahāmuniḥ etc.. There are many names that show Śiva as the great ascetic-teacher who not only preaches but also practises the path he preaches. Like Buddha, Śiva also preaches a path different from rituals—the path of penance and renunciation, a path easy for all to tread. He, like Buddha again, becomes the Teacher Divine—Guruḥ, Mahāpathaḥ etc..

The baffling paradox, however, lies in the fact that in the same breath he is the exotic Nartaka who plays on all sorts of musical instruments to keep rhythm to his dance. This dance, however, is the dance of creation and destruction which goes on continuously. This is a natural corollary to Śiva's position as the creator—destroyer which he had gained by now. In fact he now combined in him all the three actions of creation, preservation and destruction, the last one being a pre-requisite for the first one. Once risen to this highest pedestal, he imbibes in himself all the great qualities of a Bhagavān or Īśvara, the personal god of the ascetic as also the supreme Reality of the Upaniṣadic philosophers. So he becomes Acintyaḥ as also Darpaṇaḥ and Viśvarūpaḥ and Nyagrodhaḥ.

In effecting all this expansion and development of Rudra-Śiva's personality, the use of mythology is the greatest force now. Mythology helps build strong fortifications for any deity and particularly in the case of Rudra-Śiva who originally lacked any physical combats or exploits, the help of mythology was a necessity rather than a luxury. There are a number of names here which are coined to emphasise such exploits or battles with the demons, that Śiva alone could fight or perform. Jāhnavīdhṛt, Nīlakaṇṭhaḥ, Yajñāriḥ, Gajahā etc.. Śiva's benign nature is reflected in such names as Varadaḥ, Sarvakāmadaḥ etc. where he is the bountiful giver of all the wishes of a devotee. This role as the bestower of boons was in fact the natural outcome of his Vedic role of the medicine-man.

Many names like Mitraḥ, Candraḥ, Ajaikapād etc. put Śiva on an equal footing with these Vedic deities while a compromise with the current rival, Viṣṇu, was deliberately sought as is seen from many names that are found common in the Nāmāvalis addressed to Śiva and Viṣṇu. If the ascetic-Śiva was evolved as a countermeasure to thwart the Buddhist influence on the Hindu religion, Harihara or Kṛṣṇapiṅgala form of Śiva was obviously thought of as a compromising gesture to the rival Vaiṣṇavite sect. Therefore, we come across many names that are commonly used with both these great deities of the epics, *e.g.*, Yajñaḥ, Sudarśanaḥ, Kṛṣṇaḥ etc..

This Nāmāvali, however, does not contain a sufficient number of names describing the Liṅga form of Śiva to indicate the importance of Liṅga worship as a form of Śiva worship even though by this time Liṅga worship had come to be accepted by the elite also.

This brief study here of the epic-Nāmāvali from the *Mahābhārata* shows how these names speak for all the changes and upheavals that were taking place in the religious and social life of the society and how the external and internal forces have moulded the personality of this particular deity making it more sophisticated and yet acceptable in all walks of society.

After the great epics come the *Purāṇas* and the Nāmāvālis, which are more pronounced in challenging the superiority of any deity other than Śiva. The Names in all the four Nāmāvalis can be analysed under the same categories as in the *Mahābhārata* Nāmāvali. In fact, many names here are repeated from the *Mahābhārata* Nāmāvali.

The deity Śiva that these Nāmāvalis invoke is the deity that we worship today. The thing that strikes new here is the mention of the crescent moon on Śiva's Jaṭās. He is now called Candramauliḥ or Candrāpīḍaḥ, Candra means moon and so also the word Soma. In the *Vedas* 'Soma' referred only to the Somarasa but by the times of the *Purāṇas* 'Soma' came to mean moon only (because of the similarities between the moon and the exhilarating juice). Rudra and Soma (the juice) were invoked together in the *Ṛgveda*. In the epics the importance of Soma, the juice, had dwindled and so Śiva was not associated with it, but by the times of the *Purāṇas*, when the meaning was changed over the 'Moon,' Śiva once again came to be associated with it. Here again one must take into account the influence of Tantricism on Śaivism. The Tantras pay much importance to magic etc. and so to the moon, which is said to influence the human mind. This philosophy of the Tantras must have played a part in reminding the Hindus of Rudra-Śiva's association with Soma (moon), therefore, the presence of the crescent moon on Śiva's head. This further led Śiva to be associated with sorcery and magic and to be called Yantratantrasuvikhyātaḥ.

Śiva's consort Umā is now distinctly mentioned and he is Umāpatiḥ, where Umā now gained the stature of the Mother Goddess. The compromising attitude towards Viṣṇu was still in the process as suggested by names like Çakrahastaḥ, Śaṅkhī, Nīlalohitaḥ etc..

Maintaining the position as The Supreme Lord of the Universe, Śiva is the creator-preserver-destroyer-the immanent deity, the teacher, the bountiful giver, the saviour. The use of mythologies to strengthen all these qualities is now more natural and done as a matter of right. Some names suggest how the accepted stories are twisted to gain the wanted result as in the name Narasiṅhanipātanaḥ--the incarnation of Viṣṇu–as Narasiṅha is by a twist to the well known myth, shown inferior to Śiva. Furthermore, Śiva is more socialised as he is equated not only with other deities but also with great sages like Atriḥ, Kaśyapaḥ, Kauśikaḥ etc..

Śiva, the great ascetic of the *Mahābhārata*, looms supreme here also, where he is more pronouncedly Buddhist or Jain as the names suggest-Nagnaḥ, Nagnavṛttidharaḥ. The name Pādapāsanaḥ obviously refers to the sitting posture of Buddha as also the glorification of purity of mind and body seen in names as Śuciḥ, Śucivrataḥ. His striking force is now directed more to the Sins than the sinner and thus he becomes the saviour of the sinner who goes through penance etc.. He is Pāpaśāsanaḥ. As Prétacārī, he symbolises the extreme renunciation. As Upadeśakaraḥ or Buddhaḥ, he guides and preaches. All these multifarious activities of Śiva are now a part of his personality.

The expansion of the personality of Rudra-Śiva is so vast and in so many diverse directions that one is at a loss to determine and pinpoint the specific quality of this deity. All these twists and turns, expansions and adjustments are appropriated to maintain the supreme position of the Lord. This is the deity that has been moulded by the needs of the religious and social forces. When almost all the Vedic deities obliterated into the past, remaining stagnant, only Śiva continues to expand and change. All these changes are dutifully noted by these Nāmāvalis and their study gives a complete picture of Śiva's emergence on the Hindu pantheon from the neglected past.

PĀLI AND PRAKRIT

SOCIAL REALITY AS DEPICTED IN THE GĀTHĀSAPTAŚATĪ OF HĀLA*

NALINEE CHAPEKAR

FROM the available history of the Sātavāhana dynasty it is concluded that Hāla, the compiler of the *Gāthāsaptaśatī* (*GS*) belonged to the Maharashtra region and to the dynasty which ruled in the period between second century or first century B.C. and the second century A.D.. Weber assigns the period of third century A.D. to the text. Mandalik, who for the first time discussed the problem of Sātavāhana and his text, places the author in the first century A.D. (*JBBRAS* Vol. X, 1879). It is, thus, evident that the text of the *GS* gives the picture of the society in Maharashtra region in the period between the second century B.C. and the second century A.D.. The Gāthās are mainly erotic and depict the picture of love in union, love in separation and even illicit and unbridled kind of love, yet they cover a very wide field of social life and activity. The *GS* is the earliest work in the Mahārāṣṭrī dilect, originally the dilect of Maharashtra.

The *GS* is undoubtedly a secular poem and is closely related with the masses. The common people, it appears, were generally not interested in the Politics of the times, possibly because their life was not much affected by the contemporary political upheavals. Consequently perhaps the book very rarely reflects the political conditions of the times. The text refers to the king by terms Narāhiva (364)[1] Puhavīsa (774), Mahārāa (814) and Rāa (396). It was disasterous to discuss anything against the king even in the secret. Within the territory of his influence, no one dared to help even the wife of the enemy (Sattu-ghariṇī) (595). The reference to the running away of the enemies in the verse 471, is according to

---

* An essay submitted for the V. N. Mandlik Gold Medal and Prize-1978, of the University of Bombay in August, 1979.

[1] Through out this essay the text of the GS as given by Joglekar is accepted. The rendering of the Gāthās by Basak is followed and the text is offen compared with that in weber.

Joglekar, to the defeat of some king of Uttarāpatha by the Sātavāhanas. Superior officials or the countries are not mentioned in the text. There are, however, various references to Gāmaṇī, the village chief. It seems that the village was the smallest unit in the administrative hierarchy and was autonomous in character. It was duty of the Gāmaṇī to protect the village from the attacks of enemies and robbers. One stanza refers to the Gāmaṇī wounded while fighting (631). It is suggested that the office of the Gāmaṇī was hereditory and the son inherited from his father the Gāmaṇīship with all its responsibilities (628, 632). The civil duties of the Gāmaṇī, however, are not stated in the text. The villages reposed full confidence in him for its protection in times of difficulties. Information regarding the contemporary mode of administration is, however, gained from the various contemporary epigraphical records. The village head, strangely enough, is not at all mentioned in the inscriptions. The literary text, the *GS*, on the other hand, does not refer to any other official but the Gāmaṇī, perhaps because the verses depict the life of the common man in the village. All aspects of society, the life in the villages, the domestic life of the people, their economic, religious and moral conditions are depicted in these verses.

I. Rural Life :

All aspects of rural life stand revealed in this poem. The different elements of Nature described as incidents in this love poetry take place in the open air. They have the freshness of Nature itself. All six seasons are described with their peculiarities. The Viñjha mountain is repeatedly mentioned (70,115). Rivers like Godāvarī, Muralā, Nammaā, Revā and Tāvī have been referred to. Various trees, plants, flowers, birds as well as wild and domestic beasts find a place here. Nature is a part of life of people living in villages and towns.

I.1. Town-planning : There is very little material available in the text to ascertain the nature of town-planning of the times. No name of any particular city, town or village is mentioned. The words Gāma, Palli and Naara are used for indicating a settlement of people. The text does not specifically mention the size of these settlements. It seems that Palli is a small limited village. Gāma is bigger than Palli and is thickly populated. There are a few references to Giriggāma, a mountain village, situated on the mountain, surrounded by natural beauty (635, 636). A village near the Vindhya mountain was situated in such a way that the people could resort to the protection of the mountain when any occasion required it. On the boundary of the village (Gāmasīmā) scare-crows made up of straw (Taṇapurisa) were erected, perhaps to ward off robbers (745). There was a public ground (Gāmaṅgaṇa), where villagers could gather in emergency or at festivals (556). The village was protected by a guard (Tittila). Many villages had ponds nearby (8, 110, 301). One village has only one well for water, under a banyan tree (294). The ponds were full of lotuses and they enhanced the beauty of the village (8, 110). Ratthā (140, 190) or Racchā (241, 393, 419, 623) denote the village streets. The terms presuppose the knowledge of chariots but actual reference to chariot occurs only once and that too in connection with the Sun. A zigzag road (Racchā) in a wretched village (Maaggāma) and a broad (Runda) village street (Gāmaracchā) are also mentioned (850). Cross roads are referred to by the words Cattara (36), Ratthāmuha (190), and Racchāmūla. Whether these references suggest a fairly large size town or city is uncertain. A market place (Haṭṭa) is mentioned (788).

I.2. Houses : The houses in a village were situated in the close vicinity of each other and were demarketed by fences. The plan and size of the houses is not known yet they must have been of a fairly large size. Various stanzas mention the fence of the house. The material used for the fencing is not mentioned. In one instance the fence (Vaivedhana) was prepared with a material with pointed ends which looked like stakes (Sūla) (563). It was perhaps the fence of thorny bushes. Sometimes the fence was erected in such a way that the holes (Vivara) in the fence allowed a person in the court-yard to have a look at the street without himself being seen (220). An Eranḍa plant growing through the hole in the fence is mentioned (257). A court-yard in front of the house (Gehaṅgaṇa) having Māhavī creepers in blossom is described (120, 322). Paḍohara is a court-yard at the back of the house. There were trees like Arkolla (313), Pāṭala (460) in this court-yard. Mūtabandha is a foundation of a house, (Nivāsa, 233). A reference to the building on a wall is available and it is stated that a wall cannot be built up with sand as building material (Vāluāvaraṇa, 245). The wall of the house is mentioned as a good place and canvass for painting pictures. The material used for the construction of the wall is not mentioned but the surface of the wall must have been quite smooth so as to serve as the correct and pure background (Thāṇa-visuddhi) for a picture (732). A picture of Somitti painted on the wall depicting his behaviour towards Sītā, his sister-in-law, is referred to. The houses seem to have thatched roofs. A thatch of a house (ochoaa) dripping with water is mentioned (621). Another verse refers to a house with a thatch made of straw which was blown off by hurricane. (Zañzāvāuttiṇie gharammi, 315). Whether the roof was flat or slanting is not clear (954, 794). The door of the house (Gharadāra, 954, 794,, the bolt of the door (Dāraggala, 322), the threshold of the house (Dehalīdesa) from where a person steps outside a house (525) are all referred to. The road (Paaham) could be seen from the door of the house. A pitcher (Kuḍa) being shattered by the impact of the door is referred to (Gharadāra, 954). A terrace in front of the door (Ālinda, 254) and on the door way (Gharadāratoraṇa) are described. A staircase (Sovaṇavatti) is referred to (278). Houses with more than one storey are evident from the carvings in the caves at Karle, Bhaje, Badasa etc.. Staircases are also noticeable in these caves.[2]

1.3. Household Equipment : A few utensils used for domestic work are mentioned in the *GS*. A winnowing basket (Suppa, 557), a pestle (Musala, 501), a quern (Ghoraṭṭha) for grinding corn (794) are mentioned. Āsandia is a chair or coach (691). A wine glass (caasa) made of crystal (Phaliha) empty after drink is described, (927). Needle (Sui) is mentioned but not for sewing purpose. (394, 501, 720). Pottery mentioned is a pitcher (Kuḍa, 229), a pitcher for storing water (Ghaḍa, 954), a large water pitcher (Aipiulam jalakumbham, 875) and a jar (Kuḍa) for keeping milk (637). There is no reference to any pottery used for cooking purposes or for other use. A pot of emerald, a pot of gold containing jewels and a vessel of conch-shell (Saṅkhavatta) which is reddened inside (300) are the pieces of valuable containers referred to. The gold-jar was perhaps a treasure pitcher. A bed (Saaṇa, 873) and a cot (904) are mentioned. A mosquito-curtain (Gabbhahāraa) is referred to as being used for keeping away cold (766). A bed of straws (Taṇa) offered to a stranger traveller is mentioned.

---

[2] I am thankful to Dr. Mrs. Dubley for the corroborating archaeological information.

The light was obtained from an oil lamp (Dia Tella). There is a mention of the wick of the lamp (Divavatti, 264) and the flame of the lamp (Divasiha, 415) burning steadily (547). It is extinguished by the blow from the mouth (333). It is of a large size (Paiva) filled with oil (Nehalāliyāṇa), having its end blackened due to soothing (Kasaṇam hoi muham, 756). It also blackens the place where it is kept (135). In the kitchen, the fuel used was probably wood or dry cow-dung (543). The smoke of the fire is mentioned at various places. Hearths are found in the excavations at many Sātavāhana sites. The existence of various types of pottery and oil-lamps is proved by these excavations. The house found in the excavation was made up of baked bricks and consisted of two or three rooms. The walls contained wooden pillars.

I.4. Food and Drinks : In the text there are incidental references to food and drink. Three varieties of rice (Taṇḍula), (Sāli, 8, 567, 689) (Dhii, 952) and Kalama (690, 691), barley (java, 402), Tuwari (358) and Caṇaa (557) are mentioned. The grams (Caṇaa) are described as fried (Bhajjia, 557). It is said that the flour (Pittha) was prepared by beating (kuṭṭaṇa) corn into powder (388, 624, 820) though the corn is not specifically mentioned. The seasame (Tilla, 8, 627, 693), Mustard (Raia, 171), Karañja (121, 167) and Karaḍai, Kusumbha (145) are the oil seeds mentioned. Salt (Loṇa) is described as a rarity. Salt rocks (Sindhavapavvaa) are referred to for the sake of a comparison with a white cloud (679). Fruits mentioned are mango (amba, 595) Jambu (531), jujube (Bora, 240) wood-apple (Kaittha, 641), cucumber (Tausi, 534) and Kohalia. Molasses (Guḍa) being prepared from the juice of sugarcane is referred to. Sweet balls (Laḍḍua, 641), Mittha (72) and Paheṇaa (328, 603) are varieties of sweetmeats mentioned. Milk (607) and ghee (Ghia, Tuppa, 22, 289) are also mentioned in the text. Repeated references to the hunting and to the butchers carrying away buffeloes, and also the flesh of buffelo indicate that people ate flesh. Food was certainly cooked as there are references to the kitchen-fire (13, 14, 727, 728) and to the skill of the lady of the house in cooking (Randhaṇa-kammaṇiuṇiā, 14).

Occasional drinking of wine is indicated in the text. Surā (97, 197, 710), Maira (270, 550), Saraa (534), Sidhu (544), Mahurasa (978) were different varieties of wine. An old wine (Juṇṇasurā) was regarded as a better drink than the fresh one to excite the mind of a person (197). The wine was rendered fragrant with blue lotuses (534). A liquor house, in a small hut, in the outskirts of a village is mentioned (227). There are references to honey collected from flowers (Kusuma-rasa, Maaranda, Mahu, 139, 387, 495) by bees but whether it was consumed by people or not is not clear. The juice of sugar-cane (ucchu, icchu) is mentioned (541, 734).

II. Social Life :

The four castes—Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Śūdra-described in the early Brahmanical texts are not found mentioned here. There is no mention of Āryas. However, presence of Āryā is denoted by the word ‘ Ajjā ’. The term is interpreted by commentators as ‘ Noble lady, born in a high family.’ The Ajjās are sometimes described as unchaste women but many times they are depicted as modest housewives. But the caste of these ‘ high family born ’ Ajjās is not known. Other classes of people referred to in the text are Ahira (805), Khaḍia (680), Gopa (112, 114, 128, 655), Caṇḍāla (227, 804), Candila (291, 417), Dāsa (91), Pulinda (116, 310), Bhoi (556, 603, 732), Vāṇiaa (945), Vijjāhari (446) and Vāha (122, 601, 618). Among these the names Khaḍia-butcher, Gopa-cowherds, Caṇḍāla-barber, Vāṇiaa-grocer, Vāha-hunter indicate the profession of the people. Ahira and Candila indicate certain castes. Caṇḍālas are regarded as low castes. Pulindas were forest people. Vijjāharis, described in the text as demi-gods having the capacity of flying, are according to some scholars, certain tribes in the Vindhya mountain.

II.1. Education : All the people described in the *GS* were not tribe-like illiterate people. They were educated. It seems that women were also taught to read and write as a letter written to a husband (244, 571) and one received from him (827) are mentioned. Expert preceptors (Uvajjāa) used to teach people all kinds of learning and arts. Thus the study of good poetic composition (kavvālāva, 428), study of Parāsara aphorism (Parāsarasadda, 886) and a study of astrology (435) are referred to. The system of counting with the help of fingers of hand and feet (hatthesu a pāesu a aṅguligaṇaṇā, (307) or with the help of fingers of both the hands only (Gaṇantie uhaahatthaṅguria, 277) or by drawing lines (Gaṇaṇa-rehā) on the wall (Kuḍḍa, 204) is mentioned. It seems that persons were specially trained for jewel examination which is suggested by an ill-trained jewel examiner being mentioned who too much rubbed an emerald on a testing stone (627). The study of astrology was known at the time of *GS*.. Astrologers preparing their zodiacal marks or signs (Horaṃ) on boards are referred to (435).

II.2. Medical Knowledge : It seems that generally the people of the *GS* maintained good health. There are very few references to diseases. Fever (Jara, 259), Dysentric fever (Āmajara, 51), are the only ailments which have affected females as the context shows. A woman having fever for one day (Ekkadiahajaria) is said to be very attractive (259). The symptoms of cronic fever are stated. It makes a patient suffer from persistant thirst (Piāsā vahalai), loss of appetite (Na bhāi aṇṇaṃ), burning feeling (Ghaṇatāo) and repeated bristling of the skin (Khaṇakhaṇammi romañcho) of the entire body and restlessness (808). The disease of nightblindness (Ratti Andhia) is mentioned (667). But in the particular context, the person concerned is pretending the ailment rather than suffering from it. The people were well acquainted with the symptoms caused by poison. A poison is known to work powerfully all over the body (Savvaṅga-paholiraṃ, 696). Again the limbs of the body are said to become full of torpor due to poisoning (Savisāi va alasā-anti aṅgāim, 111). Whether the poison was orally taken or it was due to bite of poisonous reptile or insect is not clear.

There are some references to certain drugs (Osaha) (317), Osahi (336), Rasāaṇa (841). One drug has a natural bitter taste (Paikaḍuaṃ, 317). It's ingredients are not specified but it was boiled and administered while it was hot, as there is a reference to cooling it with mouth. An elixir (Rasāaṇa) making a person un-steady is referred to, (841). It seems that when the drug was administered, the person concerned lost his time-sense completely and a day was age-long for him. Wax as soothing agent is known. Cloth smeared with wax (Maaṇavaḍa) is used for dressing the wounds (458).

II.3. Arts and crafts : Painting appears to be the most popular and well developed art of the time. A painter (Chittara), the preparation of a correct and pure background (Thāṇavisuddhi) and the sequence of use of the colours (Vaṇṇakkama) are mentioned. Many Gāthās refer to the painting on the wall. The doll drawn on the wall (Alihiya-bhitti-vaulaa) facing the observer (ṇa parammuham) is mentioned (217). It is suggested that Rāma-story was depicted on the wall painting (55). There is a reference to drawing of an outline of portrait without disposition of colours. (vaṇṇakkamarahia, 612). It seems that the paintings were multi-coloured since brushes (vatti) are mentioned in plural. A board or canvas (Phalaa) was used for painting a picture. A series of painted images (Paḍimāpaḍivāḍi) is referred to (530). There is a reference to a picture of sweet-meat (Laḍḍua) drawn in such a life-like manner that a poor man (Pāmara) is deceived and comes to know the fact of it's being a picture only when he actually touches it. This advanced knowledge of painting is corroborated by the paintings in the caves of Bhaje and Kanheri etc.. Dancing, singing and enacting a play were also popular among the people.

Various crafts are mentioned or suggested in the text of the *GS*.. The reference to jewels and golden ornaments suggest the craft of the goldsmith. The touch-stone for testing the gold (Kaṇṇakasavitta) and a balance used by goldsmiths are mentioned. A reference to a ill-trained jeweller (Dussikkhiaraaṇaparikkhaa) suggests that the jewellers' craft was quite advanced as jewellers were specially trained for examining the quality of the jewels. A pearl (mottia) (being pearced with a needle of emarald (maragga-sūividdham) is mentioned. The mention of iron implements like arrows, ploughs, needles (sui, 501, 720), saw (Karavaṭṭa, 153), spike (Sūla), peg (Thuṇa) etc. presuppose the craft of the blacksmith. The craft of braziers is suggested by the reference to the bells, small and large (172).

II.4 Dress, Ornaments, Entertainments : The dress denoted by the terms Aṁsuka, Dukūla, Nivasana, Paṭa, Sāuli, Nikāya is the lower garment and Kañcuki, Kañcukika is upper garment of women. The references to male dress are scanty. Women wear long hair. They decorate eyes with collyrium, lips with red colour, hands with mineral dye and feet with Ālattarasa. Various ornaments of women are referred to. Lotuses, blossom of mango tree, sprouts of Tāls are used as ear ornaments. Gold ear-rings are mentioned. Necklaces are made of rubbics (Pommarāa), of emeralds (Maragaa) and of pure and valuable jewels (Visuddhajāi hāro). Bangles, girdles and anklets are used by women. The literary description about dress and ornaments is corroborated by the archaeological evidence. Women depicted in Karle and Bhaje caves use the ornaments described here. The dress also is similar. However, both males and females use elaborate and ornamental head-dresses, which are totally absent in the *GS*.

Recreations mentioned in the *GS* are dancing, singing, playing on an instrument, a game of dice, painting and enacting a drama. There is a mention of bathing (299) and swimming at noon in the lakes or rivers in the villages (473). The Phagucchaṇa (369) or Maaṇa (544, 545) is a festival of the vernal season when people in a mixed company threw mud at each other and it was considered blameless, (Niddosam). On Festive occasions like full-moon night people used to dance together (466). A drama and its prelude (Puvvaraṅga) are mentioned. The word Naḍī-actress indicates that women accepted acting as profession. The description of festivals and games indicate that women moved freely in the society.

II.5. The Position of women : In the *GS* there is the picture of modest, responsible and noble housewife as well as a proud and free rural woman. Women are described as doing various odd jobs outside the house. To supply drinking water to the travellers is a popular job, mainly secured for women. (Pavāliā, Papāpāliā, 161). A female florist and women, collecting madhuka (Mahu) flowers from the woods near the village are referred to (103, 104, 159, 598). It seems that women took part in drama and dance also, because there is a reference to an actress (Naḍī) with her face painted with the dye of Haritāla (Hariālamaṇḍia muhī) and also to a woman dancing to an accompaniment of instrumental music, (Vajjanaccari). Again a woman collecting bones and ashes of her kinsman is mentioned (104). It is not certain whether this act suggests the freedom for woman in ritual connected with funeral rites.

These jobs indicate the free movement of women in the society. But there are references to the women being taken captive (Vandi) by robbers(118), after killing their kinsmen, (Nihaabāndhavā). A lady is described as recognising the twang of her husband's bow and assuring her fellow captives by wiping their tears, (54). At another place, a captive woman mistakes the sound of the fall of thunderbolt from the cloud for the twang of the string of her husband's bow and becomes eager, (5). The captive women are described as spirited and bold and eagerly await the rescue by their husbands (527).

A prostitute is mentioned by the term Janassa Jāā-public wife. It is stated that the love of harlots is delightful to all people (Saala loassa tahṇāvaharai) but they are built-up by many crooked ways, (156). A harlot (Sāmaṇṇasundarī) is mentioned as looking attractive because she is expert in alluring gestures (Vibbhama) and is bereft of shame (Aviṇaā), (885). Harlots try to entice persons who have not been influenced by them and come under their own power as yet. (474).

II.6. Marriages : The *GS* indicates that the girls were married at the mature age. The marriage was generally settled by the elders. The friends of the bride sang wedding songs, mentioning the name of the bridegroom (Varagotta, 642). There is a reference to a girl who has chosen her partner. The friend requests the elders in family to give her away in marriage to the man of her choice (298).

Polygamy was very common and this is clearly reflected in the *GS*.. There are several references to co-wives (Savatī) as well as persons having many beloveds, (Bahuvallaha). There is a clear reference to the second marriage of a person having a first wife (Pathamagharinī) alive. He is not able to enjoy her company as he is eager to meet his new wife (Ahiṇavavahūsaṅgamassua) and the marriage day is fast approaching (Āsaṇṇavivāhadina) (479). Another gentleman is very tactful and gives company to all his lady loves turn by turn. They also do not expect more from him. (Katto miṭṭham va bahuaṁ a) (72). Another one of formal etiquettes goes to meet his wife and proves the nobility of his birth, (Ahijāi, 24, 85). Co-wives are generally jealous of each other but a wife, seeing the miserable condition of her husband becomes a messenger of her husband and goes to another woman (84). Many wives of a village-chief (Gāmaṇī) are mentioned as bedecked for self-immolation (aṇumaraṇagahiavesā) when he is about to die (449).

It is thus clear that polygamy was in vogue but there is no mention of polyandry in the *GS*.. There are, however, various references to unchaste women. They are bold enough to accept publicly the fact of their unchastity (Āma asai mha) (417). Another unchaste woman introduces her lover to her husband, who has suddenly arrived, saying, 'This man seeks our shelter. Protect him' (297); or 'This man today came from my parents' house' (301). She goes out at night to the bank of the river to a tryst. There is mention of a call of a physician-lover given by an unchaste wife even in presence of her husband under the pretext of a treatment for a scorpion-bite (237). It has been suggested that woman becomes unchaste and goes to other person because her husband is out on a journey and there is encouraging as well as unbearable atmosphere around her. However, these instances of looseness of character of some wives, by no means, reflect the society in general. Honourable place in the society is reserved for noble housewives.

III. Domestic Life :

Very cordial relations and deep love between husband and wife is reflected in the *GS*.. A good housewife is regarded as an ideal state of happy life (Kiṁ sokkhaṁ ? sukalattaṁ, 969). A husband has his eyes rivetted on the face of his wife and she is extremely happy even at his mere sight and both gaze at each other as if no one else existed (498). The pale face of a wife makes a husband cancel his decision of undertaking travel (500). The wives try to detain their husbands from going away but not always successfully. One girl separated from her husband gets emaciated and thinks her bangles grow in size (453). Another wife is almost dead (283). Some ladies count the days of husband's return by drawing lines on the wall. There appears also a husband quickening his pace at the commencement of the rainy season because he remembers the love of his wife (694). One Gāthā describes an ideal couple :

samasokkha-dukkha-parivaddhiāṇaṁ kāleṇa rūddha-pemāṇaṁ |
mihunāṇaṁ marai jaṁ taṁkhu jiai, iaraṁ muaṁ hoi || 142.

"Of a couple who has grown up equally in happiness and misery and has developed in time deep love for each other, the one may be said to live when one dies and the remaining one who continues to live may be regarded as dead." The love of such persons is free from selfishness and they do not expect any thing in return.

III.1 Housewife: The housewife is denoted by the terms Gehiṇī (825), Ghariṇī (11, 22, 205) or Gharasāmiṇī (731). She is a responsible lady. The *GS* describes the characteristics of a good housewife as—

santamasantaṁ dukkhaṁ suhaṁ ca jāo gharassa jāṇanti |
ta puttaa mahilāo sesāo jarā manussāṇaṁ || 512.

"Those women who are aware of what is good or bad and what is happines or misery for all of the home are really housewives".

Housewives behave in a proper way. It is said—

hasichi uvālambhai accuvacārchi rusiavvai |
asumhi bhaṇḍaṇāi eso maggo sumahilāṇam || 513.

"To censure by smiles, to show grievances by excessive formalities and to decorate by tears is the way of good housewives."

The right course of conduct for housewives is also chalked out thus—

hasiam adiṭṭha-dantam bhamiamaṇikkanta-dehalī-desam |
ditthamaṇukkhitta-muham eso maggo kulavahūṇam || 525

"The housewives should smile without showing their teeth, should not cross the threshold of the house without a specific reason and should look at things or persons without upraising the face".

She should not speak to her husband in the presence of elder persons. If the husband goes on a journey, she is not to weep, only her eyes betary her distressed condition. She sends away her charm (Lāaṇṇa) youth (Jovaṇṇa) and graceful movements and gestures (Vibbhamavilāsa) along with her traveller husband and they all come back with him (Pie gharam ente). Even if the husband is old (Jarāpariṇao), poor (Duggo) and ugly (Viruo) she loves him. When the family fortunes of her husband are low, she resents the pomp and show of the people of her father's house. She stands by her husband and rejects any presents or financial help offered by them (38). A wife in a home which is facing financial difficulties, is presented as behaving in a very sensible and respectable manner (290). In this manner the housewife is fully co-operative with the members of the family and makes the entire household happy and contended.

The *GS* gives a vivid picture of the daily routine of the housewife. She starts her day early in the morning with house-cleaning and cooking after taking her bath. She is very punctual in providing breakfast to the family members before they set out for their work in their fields. She also works, at times, if required in the field in guarding the harvest (690, 691), helping others in milling or in such hard labour (388). She is expert in cooking (randhaṇakammaṇiuṇiā). She brings water from well or river in the village and stores it in large pitchers (aipiulam jalakumbham, 875). Such storage jars have been found in the excavations at various sites in the Deccan in the Sātavāhana levels. In the evening, the housewife lights the lamps in the house. She waits upon her husband if he has gone out and would not eat food unless and until he eats. She is involved in the family affairs to the fullest extent and does not curse even if her husband goes astray (130, 256, 262), but urges him to come to the right path (863). In days of hardship she tries to curb the expenses and does hard labour even in pregnancy (290).

III.2. Cowives : Polygamy was certainly in vogue at the time of the *GS*.. Many verses describe the attitude of cowives towards each other.. They are generally envious to the new younger cowife. It is described that the red colour of the lips of the young wife, which was wiped off by the kiss of her lover on the previous night, is seen reflected next morning in the eyes of her cowives (106). There is also reference to the cowives weeping with thick tears (528). The young wife, on the other hand, appears as feeling proud of her command over her husband (173). She gives to her cowives ill-luck, which does not exist in her (212). The husband, even having many beloved wives, is described as thinking of his favourite one, at the time of death (499).

From these direct and indirect references to the cowives, it seems that families were rich enough to provide for many cowives. It appears that the senior wife was mostly Āryā. She maintained her status and nobility though there were other younger wives (79). Others were, perhaps, from other minor castes. The cowives, undoubtedly, were jealous of each other, but they loved their husband very much. They accept him with all his faults and for him were ready to accept even the new cowife.

III3. Family : The family depicted in the *GS* is a joint family of a limited size and of the patriarchal form, the father having an upper-hand. Many relatives and friends are mentioned : There are references to the head of the family (Gahavai, Gharilla) (107, 172, 731 etc.), husband (Daia, Pai) (7, 15, 48, 59, 54 etc.) wife (Gehiṇī, Ghariṇī) (825, 36, 38, 122 etc.) new bride (Navavahu)(479, 569 etc.), cowives (70, 106, 173 etc.), son (Utta, Putta, Ḍimbha) (84, 291 etc.), daughter (Dhūā, Kumārī, Putti) (370, 388, 407 etc.), father-in-law (Sasura) (853), mother-in-law (Sāsu) (336, 493), daughter-in-law (Soṇhā) (59, 107, 241), son-in-law (Jāmatā, 683, 810), brother-in-law (Deara, Diara) (313, 829) and sister-in-law and also to maternal aunt (Māmī) and paternal aunt (Piuccha attā) and mother's sister (Mauccha). There is no mention of the term Pia-father in the text, but the word Guru or Gurujana is repeatedly mentioned. This term obviously denotes the elders of the house. Their precise relation with the family is not clear but they seem to have authority to censure the younger couple and newly weds if they behave in an improper manner. The son-in-law seems to have enjoyed subordinate position and could not meet his wife unless the head of the family so desired. The daughter-in-law is not allowed to look at her husband in the presence of the elders or weep when her husband starts on a journey—*gurujaṇapurao dhīrāvalambiria* (367) or *vahau gurupurao jurai* (816) and once she took up the household responsibility she could not behave in a childish manner—

> *visattha-hasia-parisakkiāṇa paḍhamam jalañjali diṇṇo /*
> *pacchā vahūa gahio kuḍumbabhāro ṇimajjanto //* 606.

The mother-in-law, depicted in the *GS*, is a kind-hearted woman. She feels compassion for her daughter-in-law who is separated from her husband and takes her every possible care in the absence of her husband. The generally accepted characteristics of a mother-in-law such as of harassing or of beating the daughter-in-law, are not to be seen in the text. The Gāthā 969 gives the picture of a strict mother-in-law who gives a lot of work to her daughter-in-law, but she is justified as the improper behaviour of the daughter-in-law is indicated in the Gāthā. There is a repeated mention of the relation of brother-in-law (Diara or Devara) (677, 688, 765) who seems to have been usually the younger brother of the husband. There is seen a close relation between this borther-in-law and the sister-in-law. Sometimes the brother-in-law is successful in his advances in love with his sister-in-law (313) ; but the daughter-in-law of noble family (kulavahu) admonishes him by telling him the story of Somitti (35). In other instance, inspite of her intense dislike for the improper behaviour of the brother-in-law, the daughter in-law does not divulge his name out of fear of breaking of the family (59). The brother-in-law is expected to look after the welfare of the sister-in-law in the absence of her husband or when he is no more (765).

The Gahavai (107, 172, 297), Gehavai (962), Gharavai (951) or Gharasāmi (130, 254), who used to be the husband or at times father-in-law is the head of the family. He is the supporter and protector of the family. He is a man who himself works hard in the fields and gets work done from other agricultural labourers. A happy home presupposes good financial position of the people.

IV. Economic Conditions :

The economic conditions represented in the *GS* are of a rural set-up. Agriculture and hunting seem to have been the main professions. Other professions also like smithy, trade and commerce in jewels are referred to. Travelling appears to be a part of routine, perhaps for the sake of business and trade. Many short inscriptions on the stūpa railings and on the walls of the cave temples reveal that ordinary craftsmen and people of low levels of society were wealthy enough to make substantial donations for religious purposes. The poeple of the times of the *GS* appear to have been quite well-to-do. But the reference to poverty also are not lacking in the text (18, 32, 621). Poverty is suggested by the mention of a house in bad shape, the roof being full of holes and the rain water dripping inside (540) and a loose threaded, worn out garment of a poor man. There are many references to the women of poverty-stricken houses (Duggaa). There are references to beggers (162, 563) but the unemployment is never mentioned.

IV.1 Agriculture : There are various references to crops and fields (Chitta, Chetta) (9, 168, 567, 791) and the activities pertaining to the cultivation of land are presented. Hala or Lāṅgala is an iron plough used to till the land (165, 324). The ploughshare was worshipped by the lady of the house before starting the tilling of the land. If the ploughing continued after the rain-pour it became a strainous job for the farmer as the plough often got stuck in mud (324). The farmer, after ploughing, sowed seeds with his hands (358). He had to protect the grown-up crop from beasts and birds (952). When it was ripe he cut it, thrashed it and secured heaps of grains. Water-supply for the fields came mainly from the wells and rain-showers (324). Water was raised from the wells with the help of a contrivance called rahaṭṭaghaḍia (490) which is so familiar in Maharashtra even today.

Different crops are mentioned in the text. Three varieties of rice *viz.* Sāli (9, 567, 568), Dhii (952) and Kalama (690) were known. Rice-field was kept full of water when the crop was yet young (567). The ripe crop was cut and thrashed in a morter (568) with a pestle and rice, white like the rays of the autumnal moon, lay in a heap (689). The terms Kappāsa (805), Tūla (679), Phalahī (165, 359) and Phaliha (549) denote the cotton, cotton flowers and cotton fields. The field was protected by a strong Ahira (805). Damage was often caused to the cotton field by a buffalo. The seasame field is described as looking whitish when the dew-drops were spread all over it. The crop was damaged by wild rats (Raṇṇundura) (8, 692, 763). Turai, Channa, Java are some other crops mentioned in the text. Sugar-cance is referred to by the word Iccu (768), Puṇḍa-iccu (734) and Uccu (541). Of these it is stated that the Puṇḍaiccu was very sweet and tasted equally too even after it had dried up (734). The juice of sugar-cane and the preparation of molasses from it, is described (554) and a machine (Janata) for crushing sugar-cane (554, 770) is also referred to. Mustard (Raia) is mentioned as growing on the banks of the Godāvarī (171).

IV.2 Other Professions: Hunting is the profession of forest tribes like Pulindas (116) as well as of the hunters staying in settlements (121). They hunt tigers and deers for skins and elephants for tusks. Bow and arrows were main weapons while quiver (Kāṇḍakaraṇḍaa) was carried on the back (630). Profession of a barber (Candila) and a butcher (khadia) who used to kill buffaloes (Mahisa) (291, 680) are explicitly stated. The description of string of rubies (Pommarāa) and emeralds (Maragaa) presupposes the profession of a jeweller while a reference to the balance of goldsmith (Sonāratulā) suggests the existence of a goldsmith. The profession of a blacksmith is suggested by various iron implements such as Ploughshare, (Hala and Lāṅgala, (690), stakes and spikes (Thaṇṇu and sūla, 64), goad (Aṅkusa, 993), saw (Karawatta, 153) and the needle (Sui, 501). The profession of a brasier is suggested by a string of large bell (Duṇḍuadāma, 172) while that of a coppersmith is indicated by Kalasa (14) made out of copper. There is no direct mention of spinners, weavers or dyers but their existence is indicated by reference to cotton (165, 359), cloth (18) and the colours of cloth like blue (Nīla, 329) or saffron (Kusumbha, 545). A glass-worker (Kācakāra) is suggested by various references to bangles (Valla, 339). Various wooden articles such as pestle (Musala, 501), the Persian wheel or the water-raising device (Rahaṭṭaghaḍia, 490), wooden-grinder (Ghorattha, 794) etc. indicate the profession of carpenter. Various references to clay-pots suggest the profession of potters. It seems that both baked and unbaked pottery was used. Kuḍa (229), Kumbha (654) Ghaḍa (954) and Rahaṭṭaghaḍia (490) are the varieties of terra cotta pots which find a mention in text. All these pots were connected with storing and raising of water. Curiously enough none of the utensils of daily use are mentioned though they have been found at every Sātavāhana site in the Deccan.

IV.3 Trade and Commerce: There is no direct reference to the trade in the text, but it is indicated by the repeated references to the travellers going on a journey of long duration. The travel was not undertaken as a pleasure trip because the Pahia is always mentioned as going alone leaving his wife and people at home. The duration was so long that he used to write letters (827) and expected back the replies from his wife (244, 835). The mode of conveyance is not mentioned. Coins are not mentioned in the text though certainly they must have been current. Barter system is indicated when a poor farmer is described to have purchased a bull in exchange of his quilt (Vikkiṇai pāiḍim vailleṇa 238). Other commercial transactions are indicated by the mention of a weighing balance (191), a measure of grains (152) and a measure of liquids like milk, called khārī (806). The discovery of different types of coins at different places suggest the commercial acitivity of the times. Roman gold coins found at various sites indicate Maharashtra's commercial relations with the outside world. The inscriptional evidence also corroborates the flourishing trade and the economic prosperity of the people.

IV.4 Banking Facilities: The *GS* mentions the system of keeping the deposits. It states that sometimes the banker is not reliable and it becomes difficult to get the amount back (154). A good banker protected the deposit (Nāsa) very well (196). A custom about loan is mentioned and it is said that when a father was not able to repay the loan in his life time, the responsibility of repayment passed on to his son (113). The *GS* indicates that the popular system of keeping money safe, at times, was to keep the treasures underground. Wealth was put in a pitcher (Nihikalasa or nihāṇakalasa, 373, 378) and was buried in the ground.

V. Religious Conditions:

The people at the time of the *GS* were religious minded. They believed in gods. They also have many beliefs such as gods are always young, the gods have only three stages of life—birth, childhood and youth (593), gods never shut their eyes (592), when Viṣṇu shuts his right eye there is darkness everywhere (810). Belief in destiny is mentioned at several places. Ways of destiny are indescribable (132, 212, 245 etc.). Reward of deeds is controlled by destiny (279). The Brahmanical legends about Viṣṇu, Lakṣmī, Kṛṣṇa are known. Even the ladies are conversant with the stories of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Mahābhārata*. Vedic gods like Indra and Prajāpati are not regarded as important as compared to Rāma and Kṛṣṇa. Sacrificial ritual was not very popular. There is only one reference to Hotā, the priest in the Gāthā 722. It seems that Bhāgavata and Śaiva cults were popular. The cult of Kāpālika is also indicated in the Gāthā 408. The sun-worship and the morning and evening oblations were very common.

V.1 Vedic and Purāṇic Gods : Worship of various gods was prevelant. The text refers to Vedic gods like Agni, Indra, Śiva and Sūrya ; Purāṇic gods like Rāma, Kṛṣṇa, Vāmana, Lakṣmī and Gaṇapati ; and rural gods like Ajjā. Agni is referred to by the terms Hutavaha (211), Sikhi (14), and Amitradahana (721). This Agni is not connected with sacrifice. However, there is a clear reference to the fire burning in the sacrificial altar (227). Suraṇāha (858) is the Vedic god Indra and Suracāva (584) is the bow of Indra. Prajāpati or Vidhi is described as the creator of the universe and responsible for the union and separation of human beings (963, 976, 235). Śiva the helper of the families in destress (467) appears to be the popular god. He is described by the epithets Pasuvai, Hara, and Pamahahiva. The spouse of Hara (Haravahū) is requested to give refuge to the devotee (985). Solar worship was current at the time of the *GS* for even Lord Śiva is described as paying homage to the Sun (448, 700). Here Weber sees the indirect influence of Persia. People seem to have been well acquainted with the epic stories of Rāma and Kṛṣṇa, the Paurāṇic gods (35, 443, 117). Rāhiā (Rādhā) also is mentioned (89). The dwarf incarnation of Viṣṇu (Vāmana) (406) and the third step of Hari (411) have been referred to. Lacchī (388) or Sirī (810) is goddess Lakṣmī. Gaṇavai and Gaṇāhivai is the elephant faced god Gaṇapati (403, 372). A temple, dedicated to the worship of Ajjā, a rural goddess (Ajjāghara) (172) is mentioned. There are a few references to temples and shrines (64, 109, 190) and to idol worship (194, 858, 372).

V.2 Buddhism : Buddhists are clearly mentioned in the Gāthā :

kīramuhasacchahehim rehai vasuhā palāsakusumehim /
buddhasa calaṇavandaṇa-paḍiehim va bhikkhusaṅghehim // 308.

"Earth looks splendid with the red flowers of the palāśa trees which resemble the beaks of parrots as if they were the congragated monks fallen, for worship at the feet of Buddha". The verse contains an allusion to the yellow or brown robes of the Buddhist priests. Here the icon of Buddha is referred to, but other iconographical details are not given.

Two other verses may be taken as indicating the Buddhist influence. A hunter is described as putting aside his bow when he sees a couple of deer trying to protect each other from his arrows

CC-0. In Public Domain. Gurūkul Kangri Collection, Haridwar

(601). The influence of the principle of non-violence is seen here. Again, fire from sacrificial altar is compared to fire burning in a hut (227). It may suggest that the sacrificial religion had become a matter of derision and censure. The epigraphical evidence shows the popularity of Buddhism and the Nasik inscription records that Kaṇha, the second King of Sātavāhana dynasty and a predecessor of Queen Nagnikā, appointed a special officer-Samaṇāṇam mahāmata to look after the well-being of the monks residing on the Tiranhu Mountain. Various donations from the lay followers of Buddhism are mentioned in various cave inscriptions. The Gāthā No. 308 decisively points out, according to Weber, to a time in which the glorification of the Buddha had been frequent enough in order to be employed as a popular picture.

However, the inscriptions of Kṣatrapa Nahapāna and his son-in-law Uśavadāta show that they gave donations to the Brahmins. The famous Naneghat inscription of Queen Nagnikā pays homage to Vedic deities like Indra, Sūrya, Candra along with the Purāṇic deities like Vasudeva and Saṁkarṣaṇa. The Sātavāhanas themselves were Hindus. The text of the *GS* also does not indicate the strong influence of Buddhism on the society in general.

Epilogue :

Religious tolerence appears to have prevailed in Maharashtra as the reference to different deities in the Gāthās indicate. Many arts received patronage and encouragement from Sātavāhanas. They appear to have been interested in Prakrit rather than Sanskrit hence Prakrit poetry thrived under them. The *Gāthāsaptaśatī* is a literary document of social history and in a sence is a complimentary work to the official documents like inscriptions and coins and archaeological findings of the Sātavāhana times. It is an important text for the students of the Alamkāraśāstra as it is the earliest text available in Prakrit. It reflects the mind of the common man. Literature is always the mirror of social life and reflection in this mirror of literature often has permanency of its own. Daṇḍin has wisely spoken of this aspect in his *Kāvyādarśa.* The social reality, as reflected, in the *GS.* therefore, has a sort of permanency bestowed by the poets of the Sātavāhana times. Hence,

sātavāhanakālīnaṁ suramyaṁ grāmajīvanam /
gāthādarpaṇasaṁkrāntaṁ kasya no harate manaḥ //

ANATTĀVĀDA IN THE SUTTAPIṬAKA*

JOAQUIN PEREZ REMON

The Problem

WHILE studying for the B.A. and M.A. degrees in Sanskrit, with Pāli as subsidiary language, from my readings of the prescribed texts and other literature I conceived some misgivings about the doctrine of absolute *anattā* attributed to the Buddha. I felt things were not as clear as most of the scholars took them to be. Then a secret wish arose in my mind: 'If I ever get the chance to study this point I shall do it.' The chance presented itself when I decided to work for the Ph.D. degree. No systematic study on the question had been successfully undertaken before that, taking into account, *all* the references to *attā* found in the Pāli canon. The authors that touched upon the question did it in a perfunctory way, remarking upon only some texts here and there, neglecting to consider the context and taking for granted that the question of absolute *anattā* was unassailable, settled once and for all, and even thinking that the opposite view was not only improbable but *a priori* quite impervious to proof.

There are two sets of texts in the Pāli Scriptures bearing on *attā*. In the first set, the reality of *attā* is affirmed in the most natural way and even given a place of honour, presenting it as man's highest value and as the moral agent of liberation. They speak of it even as any other system maintaining the reality of *attā* would do. Its role as protagonist in the process of liberation makes it at times fall a prey to evil, and on the other hand, through self-exertion and self-control causes it to advance on the way to liberation until perfection is achieved and *nibbāna* attained. One who has reached the peak of perfection is said to dwell with a *self brahma-become* (*brahmabhūto*) and one whose self has been "nirvanized" (*nibbutatto*).

---

* Submitted to the University of Bombay in 1975. Published under the title '*Self and non-Self in early Buddhism*', Mouton Publishers, Hague, 1980.

All these texts cannot be ignored altogether or set aside as being merely a conventional way of talking, without thereby any reality being attached to *attā.* The analysis of the texts themselves gives the lie to such a superficial way of disposing of them. Saying, as many do, that all these usages of *attā* have a reflexive sense is saying nothing new. Reflexive means "implying agent's action upon himself", and it is in the order of things and of the nature of the self that any exertion it does towards perfection ought to have issue precisely in *self*-perfection and ultimately in *self*-liberation. Obviously there are cases when *attā* is used in expressions having no relation to morality or spiritual perfection. It is then and only then that a "merely reflexive sense" of *attā* will be admissible. To apply this interpretation to other texts is to take the edge off them and render them meaningless, against what the texts themselves in the most direct and spontaneous way try to convey.

In the second set of texts, *attā* is denied either through the denial of it as a positive term or through the predication of the negative term *anattā.* The nature of this denial will be explained below.

Now, the very existence of these two sets of texts posits a problem. Ought one of the sets–the first one, of course–to be explained away in one way or another, and only the second accepted as the basic teaching of the Buddha? Or are the two sets at variance with one another so as to represent two different and contradictory traditions? Finally, may both the sets be reckoned, so to say, as a thesis and an antithesis whose synthesis is not only possible but demanded by the texts themselves?

The truth of the matter is that the second set of texts does not directly deny the *attā* of the first set. They only say that certain things that people of other creeds take to be the self ought to be seen through superior wisdom, as they really are, as something not being the self, or belonging to the self, or being in the self, or the self being in them. This contrast, by itself, implicitly asserts the reality of the self, a reality denied of those things, namely the existential factors (*khandhas*). This reality is enhanced by the fact that the intuition having as its object the existential factors as not-being-the-self, will be followed by disgust of them—precisely for not being the self—, rejection and consequent liberation. Whose liberation? Obviously of what is asserted by contrast by the said disgust and utter rejection, namely the true self.

Methodology

The method to be followed was on the main hermeneutical. This demanded making the texts speak for themselves, analysing them very particularly so as to bring out their full import, and comparing parallel passages for their mutual elucidation. In this task the careful examination of the context was of paramount importance. It is easy to read into a text isolated from its context what one is predisposed to find in it, while the context imposes itself in such a way as to make compulsory the adoption of the only sense that befits it. Certain *anattā* texts —*sabbaṁ annattā*, to give an example—may have the ring of absolute *anattā*, which is not the case when read within their original context.

When undertaking the redaction of the thesis I was faced with the problem of how to arrange and organise the great amount of evidence accumulated while reading the sources. I decided to present all the positive evidence under the heading, " The existential self," since all the texts of this type refer to the self's involvement in the process of liberation as moral agent. The treatment of the other set of texts would bear the heading, " The metaphysical self," since they contemplate the self as opposed to whatever is empirical, as opposed by its very nature to any thing other than self.

It was peremptory to find a unitary element that could run through both parts of the thesis as a "leit-motif," and could prove to be decisive when trying to judge the different usages of the term *attā* in terms of reality or unreality. The need of such unitary element was brought up to me by Dr. Mainkar's suggestion that to my treatment of the reality of *attā*, in its positive aspect, anyone would reply adducing the well known distinction between the conventional and the real self, concluding, of course, that all those references applied exclusively to a conventional self.

I had to show that such a distinction was of no consequence in Early Buddhism. The way the *Niddesa* comments on the term *attā* gave me the clue. Some usages of *attā* that would be disparaged by some people as referring to a mere conventional self are disapproved in the *Niddesa* not for that reason, but because they reflect a heretical frame of mind. This frame of mind consists in the identification of the self with the existential factors (*sakkāyadiṭṭhi*), *asmimāna* being another name for it. Any usage of the term *attā* implying this frame of mind refers to a false non-existing self. This means, in practice, that the presence or absence of *asmimāna*, when referring to *attā*, settles the question whether the speaker has in mind a false self or the true one. This distinction is the fundamental one in Early Buddhism and should be kept in mind when discriminating between the different usages of the term *attā*. I consider this the greatest discovery of my research and handy tool for the interpretation of otherwise obscure passages.

Conclusion

The main conclusion of the thesis is that the *anattā* doctrine taught in the *Suttapiṭaka* has only a relative value, not an absolute one. It insists on the fact that the existential factors are in no way the self or intrinsically related to it, never expressing or implying denial of the self itself. An absolute, flat denial of the reality of the self is nowhere found in the *Suttapiṭaka*. Such would have been, for instance, an utterance such as, *puriso, bhikkhave, anattā*, but such an utterance is wholly absent.

It is, therefore, possible to make a synthesis of the two sets of texts mentioned above. The two sets approach the reality of the self from two different points of view, without contradicting one another. There is no denying that the synthesis has its difficulties arising from the moral involvement of the self in the process of liberation. Without gainsaying such involvement—this denial would be an admission of *akiriyavāda*, the greatest moral heresy in Early Buddhism-, the Buddha refused to discuss the question, as indicated in more than one passage of the Scriptures. Any endeavour to elucidate it would be tantamount to trying to go " ahead of the Master." The synthesis that is utterly impossible from the viewpoint of Early Buddhism is the synthesis into a coherent whole of what is self and what is non-self. An irreducible polarity between these two prevails all through the *Suttapiṭaka*.

To describe the efforts of the true self towards liberation on the existential level is one thing, and to investigate its real positive nature is another thing. The former is possible provided it is done without any admixture of *asmimāna*, while the latter is rendered impossible by the second set of texts. Early Buddhism could say what the self is not, but could never utter any possitive statement as to the self's nature all by itself. The self is in itself absolutely transcendent, such being the result of the above mentioned polarity which opens an impassable gulf between the self and the non-self. All our knowledge, however, moves on the empirical level and is, therefore, unable to apprehend the ontological nature of the self and to express it. That is why, regarding the liberated man, Early Buddhism could not say that he is, that he is not, that both he is and he is not, that both he neither is nor is not. This is like saying that the essential core of man is an ineffable mystery.

RELEGION AND PHILOSOPHY

PĀÑCARĀTRA-SAṀHITĀS—A STUDY*

P. P. APTE

THE word Pāñcarātra (also spelt as Pañcarātra) enjoys a rare privilege of representing some important religious doctrine, for a pretty long period. The use of the word Pañcarātra in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* may be termed as its earliest recognition and its legal use in the field of religious endowments by the State Governments in South India may be termed as its latest recognition. The name Pañcarātra or Pāñcarātra is that way well known ; but at the same time it is doubtful whether it is well understood in its true perspective. At present, it is used to denote one of the two sections of the temple-religion of Vaiṣṇavas (*Vaiṣṇavāgama*), especially in South India, namely *Pāñcarātrāgama* and *Vaikhānasa-āgama*. On the same lines the temple-religion of Śaivas is called *Saivāgama*.

The *Pāñcarātra Āgama* abounds in objective evidence useful for its historical study in the form of canonical works (*Saṁhitās*), temples with ritualistic tradition and faithful adherents conserving the ageold tradition of ideal way of life. Inspite of this, the picture of this cult has not been clear to the scholarly world. The main reason for this state of affairs is that the available sources have not been adequately explored and exploited in this direction. Consequently it leaves ample scope for fresh research. In the following pages, an attempt is made to furnish some observations on the 'name, origin, and growth' of the Pāñcarātra, based on the analysis of the material gathered from canonical as well as non-canonical works and the research work already done in the field.

The Pāñcarātra, during its pretty long range of evolution, seems to have passed through various phases. One may presume, for the sake of convenience, four main stages of its evolution :

(*i*) Ancient period (*Ādikāla*), ranging from *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* to the *Mahābhārata* text, roughly covering the first millennium B.C..

---

* Submitted to the University of Poona in 1965.

(*ii*) Āgamic period (*Āgamakāla*), the post *Mahābhārata* period marking the creative stage of Āgamic literature and temple structure and roughly covering the first millennium A.D. .

(*iii*) Medieval period (*Ācāryakāla*), marked by the religio-spiritual activity of the Vaiṣṇava Ācāryas advocating the Pāñcarātra doctrine, and roughly covering the second millennium A.D. .

(*iv*) Modern period (*Ādhunikakāla*), marked by the research activity by Indian and Western scholars in the field.

Origin of the Pāñcarātra

1. God, as the cosmic Puruṣa with thousand heads etc. has already been visualised in the Puruṣa-Sūkta of the *Ṛgveda*, according to the interpretation of the followers of the Pāñcarātra tradition.

2. The name Pāñcarātra is traced to the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* in which Nārāyaṇa is propitiated by a sacrifice continued for five nights.

3. The *Ekāyana* is included as a topic of study in the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*. But one cannot be certain whether it is the same as the *Ekāyana-Veda* which the followers of the Pāñcarātra accepted as their sacred scripture.

4. Vāsudeva was adored as the one and only Supreme God at the time of Pāṇini (c. 600 B.C.) by a group of people and His worship continued even at the time of the composition of the *Mahābhārata* or even later.

5. The worship of Saṅkarṣaṇa had prevailed at the time of Kauṭilya (c. 400 B.C.).

6. The worship and consecration of Saṅkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva in Temples continued at the time of Patañjali (c. 100 B.C.). The *Mahābhāṣya* also associates Vṛṣṇis with the cult of Viṣvaksena, who occupies a unique place in the Pāñcarātra theism.

7. The worship of Vāsudeva, as well as of Saṅkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva together might have continued in India for a long time

at least from the second century B.C. to the beginning of the Christian Era as shown by inscriptions. During this period, the Bhāgavata religion acquired royal patronage as seen from the inscriptions which record the donations from kings, including a Greek ambassador Heliodorus, who came to be addressed by the honorific title Heliodara-*Bhāgavata*.

8. (*i*) According to the *Mahābhārata* evidence (c. 200 B.C. to 200 A.D.) Nārāyaṇa is the promulgator of the *Ekāntidharma*. The one and only object of worship is Nārāyaṇa (who is addressed as Vāsudeva or Hari), the *Sumum bonum* for His devotees.

(*ii*) The Lord causes the creation and absorption of the universe and the emancipation of souls through His manifestations known as *Vyūhas* : Vāsudeva, Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna and Aniruddha. There were four views regarding the divine manifestations which came to be known as *eka-vyūha*, *dvi-vyūha*, *tri-vyūha* and *catur-vyūha*. Of these, the theory of four manifestations seems to be the favourite philosophical theme of the authors of the *Pāñcarātra Saṁhitās*.

(*iii*) Originally, a group of ascetics followed the *Ekāntidharma*, asserting faith in one and one God alone. The people worshipping Nārāyaṇa according to the *Sāttvata* mode, preserved this *dharma* which came to be known also by the names : *Sāttvata* and *Bhāgavata*.

(*iv*) Furthermore, the Pāñcarātra religion existed side by side with *Veda-Āraṇyaka* on the one hand and Sāṅkhya-Yoga on the other. Some of these doctrines were incorporated in the Pāñcarātra.

(*v*) The *Ekāntidharma* intermittently revealed to the ascetics who had dedicated themselves to the worship of Nārāyaṇa and the Sāttvatas preserved this doctrine in their developed mode of ritual worship. Finally the Pāñcarātra absorbed this doctrine through the Sāttvatas. The *Gītā* represents the later phase of the *Ekānti-dharma*, while the Pāñcarātra which emerged at the beginning of the Kaliyuga of Padmaja-the lotus-birth of Brahmā, forms the latest phase in the development of Bhāgavata theism. In view of this explanation, the origin of the Pāñcarātra theism may go back to a date not earlier than the teaching of Kṛṣṇa in the *Bhagavadgītā*.

(*vi*) The Pāñcarātra religion has developed in the background of the closely associated *Ekānti-Bhāgavata-Sāttvata* doctrines. The source of inspiration for the Pāñcarātra is the quint-essence of these doctrines which Nārāyaṇa or Vāsudeva Himself expounded, before the advent of Kaliyuga, through His Kṛṣṇa incarnation.

9. The Pāñcarātra religion that has come down to us along with its temples, its ritualistic tradition and its *Saṁhitā*-literature, might have established itself as an independent system, somewhere during the time of the final redaction of the *Mahābhārata* text.

The second phase, known as Āgamic phase, (*Āgamakāla*) ranging from 300 to 800 A.D. shows the growth of the Pāñcarātra as an Āgmic personality reflected in classical and post-classical *Saṁhitās*.

The third phase covering the medieval period, (*Ācāryakāla*) was prevailed by the religio-social activities of the Ācāryas: Yamunācārya, Rāmānujācārya and Vedāntadeśika. They defend the Pāñcarātra religion against the attacks made by the contemporary rival systems.

The modern phase (*Ādhunika-kāla*) is marked by the collection, preservation, publication of the Pāñcarātra canonical works and study of various aspects of Pāñcarātra religion and literature by modern research scholars, both Indian and foreign.

The Pāñcarātra thought reflected a spirit of integration throughout its evolution, which gave this religion a composite personality. In its early phase, there was an integration of three objects of worship—Viṣṇu, Nārāyaṇa and Vāsudeva. There was also a culmination of the teachings of the *Veda*, *Āraṇyaka*, Sāṅkhya and Yoga into the Pāñcarātra teaching during the early phase. In the Āgamic phase similar harmonising efforts seem to have resulted into the compromise formulae of worship such as *Bráhmopaniṣad*, *Siddhānta-catuṣṭaya*, *Catuḥsthānārcana* etc.. The integration-process of the Pāñcarātra mainly included Vedic, Yogic, Tantric and local religious traits. The Tantric influence crept in this religion in the early phase and went on increasing during the classical Saṁhitā-period and decreasing during the temple-oriented *Saṁhitā*-period. The Āgamic phase represented the creative period of the Pāñcarātra-religion in the fields of literature, architecture and sectarian expansion admitting new individuals, groups and temple-institutions in its fold. The post-classical *Saṁhitā*-period gave rise to the creative activity of temple-building in South India, on a systematic and scientific basis. This was also a creative period for the temple-oriented canonical literature. The influence of the Pāñcarātra religion in South India rose to the royal level during the Āgamic period and received generous patronage from Cola, Pāṇḍya and other South Indian royal dynasties. The stewardship of the Pāñcarātra religion, along with its vast literature, monumental temples and numerous devotees passed on to the socio-spiritual leadership of Vaiṣṇava Ācāryas, at the end of the Āgamic period.

Pāñcarātra was known to the *Purāṇas* in both philosophical and ritualistic aspects. The *Purāṇas*, however, are divided in their estimation of the Pāñcarātra cult ; some of them praise the Pāñcarātra school and its teachings in a way which sounds almost hyperbolic, particularly when they say that God's grace is unachievable even after a hunt for lakhs of years, if one forsakes the infallible path paved by the Pāñcarātra, while others go to the length of saying that even a passing sight of a follower of the Pāñcarātra invariably brings great sin to the beholder. During the period of later philosophical literature like the commentaries on the *Brahmasūtras* etc., it is easy to trace the impact of the Pāñcarātra doctrine ; since the doctrine of Vyūhas has been a target of criticism, favourable and otherwise, in the discussion of the cosmological problems.

It would, now be worthwhile to resume the analysis of whatever has been said about the salient features of this system. First of all one has to mind well that it has a longstanding faith in one God Vāsudeva-Nārāyaṇa or Viṣṇu as the supreme governing power. He is endowed with the best attributes of omnipresence, omnipotence and omniscience. The world, as contemplated by the cosmology of this thought, is 'real' and 'everlasting.' There remains no need of any assumption, therefore, of unreality of the world and then of an attempt to justify it. The matter which manifests in the inanimate world and the spirit that exhibits heterogeneous living beings are philosophically nothing but the two aspects of His own Existence, and amazingly, He is not exhausted within these two. In other words, He is simultaneously Immanent and Transcendent. Once this philosophical background is understood, a very obvious question, as to how and in what way a wallow-soul would hope to overcome the pangs of the worldly life to which it is attached, arises. The answer is very simple and a straightforward one, since, it states that the knowledge of the Divine Self, residing in one's own self and further realisation of the spiritual kinship between the two, is the only way to real and eternal happiness. This theoretical faith is seen supplemented by the proper corollary in bodily acts *i.e.* rituals; thus making the abstract thing concrete. Technically, the code of conduct prescribed for the development of one's mind to a level of ardent devotion and full surrender of selfhood (*Prapatti*) before the Divine Power, wins the favour of the Lord. And instantaneously, the knowledge which is otherwise very hard to attain becomes miraculously easy. This power is the golden key that unlocks the treasure of knowledge leading to Mokṣa, the aspired happiness that never fades. The way of propitiation is popularly known as idol-worship. The Pāñcarātra believes in *Arcāvatāra*—the image-incarnation of the Lord as a real manifestation. This theory of the Pāñcarātra has been an unestimable contribution to the Hindu civilization. This 'Image' is normally enshrined in a construction called temple; and that explains why the paraphernalia of rituals became a religion of temple-worship. The temple contains the principal deity, flanked by a number of retinue deities. An atmosphere of piety and serenity is to be maintained in the temple precincts. This also has been a specific contribution to cultural life of the society. The Pāñcarātra has indeed contributed to the religion of theism by elaborately discussing the path of worship and its significance. The words '*Prapatti*' and '*Śaraṇāgati*' are preferred in the *Saṁhitās* to the simple word '*Bhakti*.' The significance of this can be brought out in the words of P. V. Kane (*History of Dharmaśāstra*, vol. V, p. 952): 'The word '*Prapadye*' in the *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* serves as the basis of the doctrine of *Prapatti* in the Vaiṣṇavite system.' Thus the origin of this thought lies in the Śruti-literature.

The propriety of the ritualistic activities has been explained by V. M. Apte (*Social and Religious life in the Gṛhyasūtras*, p. 206-7): 'If religion is the sense of duty which we feel from the relation in which we stand to some superior power then a rite is a formal act of religion. In fact, the general tendency of Indian literature was to ritualize all action and spiritualize all life.' If religion is viewed in this light, one may doubtlessly opine that the Pāñcarātra pertinently stands to this definition in its proper sense.

The Pāñcarātra had to face a varied criticism, especially when a serious attack in the form of its condemnation that the Pāñcarātrikas are *Pañcama Brāhmaṇas* of a lower caste, was levelled. Yāmunācārya has specially discussed these points in his *Āgama-Prāmāṇya* and needs no repetition here. It would be sufficient to note the summary of Yāmunācārya's argument given by Dasgupta : " The argument of the opponents that the Bhāgavatas are not Brahmins are all fallacious, since the Bhāgavatas have the same mark of Brahmanhood as all Brahmins. The fact that Manu describes the Pañcama caste as Sāttvata does not prove that all Sāttvatas are Pañcamas. Moreover, the interpretation of the word Sāttvata by opponents would be contradictory to many scriptural texts, where Sāttvatas are praised. That some Sāttvatas live by image-building and temple-building and such other works relating to temple does not imply that this is the duty of all the Bhāgavatas.' (*History of Indian Philosophy* Vol. III p. 12-17).

About the attitude of the Pāñcarātra towards the *Vedas* it would suffice to observe that on the whole, the Pāñcarātra owes much to the *Vedas*, both in its philosophical as well as in practical courses. The speciality of the former lies in that it lays greater stress on such rituals as are auxiliary to the nature of an aspiring mind, as it craves for a fruit which can be nothing short of permanent bliss *i.e. Mokṣa*. On its ritualistic plane, it is evident, that it has given full scope to the Vedic rites and Vedic *mantras*, of course, simplifying and modifying those whenever necessary so as to suit the relevant purpose. At the same time, it endeavoured to avoid *hiṁsā*, the element of violence involved in the animal oblations, evidently to safeguard its basic dogma of ' *Ahiṁsā-Dharma*,' and provided an alternative in the vegetarian oblations and offerings. Secondly, it tried to accommodate in its religious fold the hitherto neglected class of the society—the Śūdras and women. This, however, invited a strong criticism from many sides. The criticism, mainly brought forth the argument that this Pāñcarātra aimes at nothing but condemnation of the *Vedas*. For instance, the *Kūrma Purāṇa* says, ' The great sinners, the Pāñcarātrins were produced as a result of killing cows in some other birth ; they are absolutely non-Vedic and that the literatures of the Śāktas, the Śaivas and the Pāñcarātrikas are for the delusion of mankind (*History of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. III, p. 19).

Now, with the study of the *Saṁhitās* concluding, the first hand information is at hand and the remark quoted above could hardly be justified. Even if we take the threefold classification—*Sāttvika*, *Rājasa* and even *Tāmasa*—furnished by the *Saṁhitās* themselves, one can hardly find any piece of literature that would be called baffling the mankind. Secondly, the Pāñcarātra has been strongly denounced by *Purāṇas* like *Parāśara* and *Sāmba*, on the count of providing admission to Śūdras and women. It needs no repetition that these and such other charges are compliments in disguise.

But critics like Śaṅkarācārya argue that this system deserves to be totally discarded, since it is opposed to the *Vedas*. It is noteworthy that Śaṅkara is not so harsh while commenting on the *Pāñcarātrādhikaraṇa*, particularly because his own argument is based on a very weak string to harp upon *i.e.* the expression of the veteran sage Śāṇḍilya that he remained intellectually unsatisfied even after a thorough study of the *Vedas* ; and secondly because Śaṅkara himself indulges in the eulogy of the Pāñcarātra for its ideal diary for religious life, the *Pañcakālaprakriyā*. Besides, as previously pointed out, it is desirable to judge the remarks, especially, their controversial points , and it would be observed that the Pāñcarātra, in general is *Veda*-abiding except as regards its outlook towards Śūdras and women and the problem of *himsā*-element.

The other group of critics captained by the *Mahābhārata*, *Varāhapurāṇa* and Vaiṣṇavite literature give this cult a high mark of religious authority by placing it at the very root of all the *Vedas*. Anyway, the general view of the most of the medieval writers on Dharmaśāstra in this regard was ' Pāñcarātra and Pāśupata Śāstras are authoritative only so far as they are not opposed to the *Vedas*.' (*History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. V, p. 962).

It would be interesting to estimate the general nature of the Pāñcarātra side by side with the *Vedas*. The most significant common feature is the profuse application of the hymns of the Puruṣasūkta in the ritualistic niceties of both the Vedic and Vaiṣṇavite practices. Secondly, the parallelism of the two sacrifices, shows fire-worship in the former and idol-worship in the latter. The former involves oblations-*bali* to the fire while the latter prefers offerings-*nivedana* to the deity. In the former, various gods, in response to the respective invocations, come and receive the honour, all the while the Agni being the mediator. In the latter, Vāsudeva is the presiding deity who at the ardent invocation, assumes Arcārūpa to relish the offerings. In addition to this worship, there is also a general worship of all the deities in the entire temple compass. This is called a *Yāga*; and the same performed in abstract meditation, is called *Mānasayāga*. Besides this, the temple rituals include the *homa* and *havana*—the Vedic rites—in propitiation of Agni. Fares and festivals play very prominent role in the socio-religious life of the Pāñcarātra. The word '*utsava*' is so composed as to signify that it is a 'superior sacrifice' since *sava* is a synonym of Vedic sacrifice. The superiority of the *utsava* according to traditional belief, lies in that it aims at *Mokṣa* as its fruit; whereas the Vedic *sava* is performed for the fulfilment of some worldly or other-wordly pleasure.

The Vedic *mantras*, and Vaiṣṇava *mantras* in form of substitutes, are used for ritualistic purpose. The *mantras* in obeissance to Viṣṇu, Nārāyaṇa or Vāsudeva are simple forms of *mantras*—'*om Viṣṇave namaḥ*; *om Nārāyaṇāya namaḥ*; *om namo bhagavate Vāsudevāya*.'

There is one more item of parallelism and that is the provision for the amendment of rituals called *Prāyascitta-vidhi* which seems to have been taken over, in principle, by the Pāñcarātra from the established canons of Dharmaśāstra. These are the points that the present system commonly holds with the *Vedas*.

The importance of the Pāñcarātra, in the life of our country, has thus been an established fact through decades of centuries. First of all, it has elevated, or tried to elevate, the Hindu mind from its temptation for mundane pleasures to the highest happiness of the emancipation of one's self. Secondly, it proved to be highly catholic in attitude and keeping pace with the march of time, by opening its doors to all who would be needy and desirous entrants. Thirdly, it tried to elucidate religion by professing idol-worship and that too with very simple rituals which any layman could afford to perform. Fourthly it tried to safeguard itself from the infiltration of any malpractice especially *vāmacāra*, the left hand trend of tantrism. It deserves wide applause for gaining success in maintaining an atmosphere of piety and serenity throughout the procedure of temple-worship.

Turning to the broad outline of he canons of the Pāñcarātra faith, one can see that it sticks to theistic metaphysics in accepting Vāsudeva to be 'all in all'. On the plane on supra-cosmic position of the Divine, it propounds the theory of *Vyūhas* which sounds advaitic, for, it refuses to accept even the slightest transformation in the Divine Being inspite of the process wherein the Unmanifest manifests itself in the world form. The *advaita non-duality* professed by the Pāñcarātra system may be termed as *Vyūhādvaita*. On the cosmic plane, however, it accepts the Sāṅkhya theory of evolution. In its ethics, the Pāñcarātra advises the votaries to plan their life according to the rules, relevant to the caste and stage of life as well as inclination of the persons concerned. For instance, Yogic practices are included in the daily routine of all; but anyone having a specialliking may develop the faculty for oneself. Thus the path of Bhakti has been harmoniously blended with Yoga. Furthermore, one is amused to note the philanthropic attitude of the cult, especially when it adequately guides the devotees on the path of worship. It encourages the devotees to offer their services to the Lord irrespective of their physical or monetary capacity or social status. Thus the principle 'each according to his capacity and fruit to be shared equally by all' is best achieved. The *Saṁhitās*, frequently warn the financially well-placed devotees against spending proportionately less in their turn of worship ; lest they might reap no fruit at all. At the same time, they do not forget to console and encourage the poor by assuring them that even a leaf, flower, fruit or pure water offered with sincere devotion brings unestimable appreciation from the Lord. It also insists on the devotees who are physically fit to offer such things as are the outcome of personal manual efforts ; and assures the invalids that they also share the spiritual fruit by helping those who actually perform the adoration.

The devotee is advised to spend his day by performing the duties assigned to him according to the *Pañcakāla*. The duties vary according to *Varṇa* and *Āśrama*. But one thing is certain, one has to watch one's own actions very jealously, since skill and accuracy properly applied in discharging one's duty, necessarily fetch the spiritual fruit; and if inefficiency or mistake is allowed to creep in, the national and social welfare is certainly hampered. The skill in which the Pāñcarātra has woven the indvidual interest with the collective interest of the society, deserves perusal by students of sociology, since it is a constantly-recurring problem confronting the helmsmen of any country. In short, the Pāñcarātra can be said to have popularised philosophy of theism by propagating and spreading it to the deepest and widest corners of social life, simplifying it in terms of practical religion, making it accessible and practicable to all according to their grasp and capacity.

Though the Pāñcarātra has its origination in the *Śrutis*, still considerable impact of the Tantric mysticim is seen on the mind of the Pāñcarātrins. The *mantras* or the spells, the *mudrās* or the mystic gestures, the *maṇḍalas* or mystic diagrams are specialised features of the Tantras. Many of our *Saṁhitās* actually bear the name Tantra—*e.g. Viṣṇu-tantra, Lakṣmī-tantra* etc. The question then arises as to what they preach in their capacity as a Tantra. It is welknown that the popular convention attaches some specific notions to the Tantras in general. For this reason, it is necessary to evaluate Pāñcarātra as a Tantra in popular sense. Kane observes, 'The matters distinguishing Tantric works from other religious literature in Sanskrit are the promise of the attainment of miraculous power, the realisation of One Supreme Principle in short time by means of Tāntric *Sādhanā* with peculiar rituals of *Mantra, Bīja, Nyāsa, Mudrā, Cakra, Yantra* etc. (*History of Dharmaśāstra* Vol. V., p. 1092). The Pāñcarātra has included within its programme, all these characteristics of Tantra and hence it may take pride in being so addressed.

The *mantras* occupy very prominent place in the Pāñcarātra which thus fulfils the description, '*Mantras* are the heart and core of Tantraśāstra, so much so, that the Śāstra is often spoken as Mantra-śāstra.' (*History of Dharmaśāstra*, Vol. V, p. 1098). The *mantras* are said to be effective only when the favour of the Guru and the concentration of the Sādhaka concur. The role of Guru as an inevitable agency in spiritual journey is recognized even in Pāñcarātra in its capacity as a true system of Tantra, since, 'Both Hindu and Buddhist Tantras lay great emphasis on the importance of and qualifications of Guru,' (*History of Dharmaśāstra* Vol. V, p. 1071) who is on par with the Lord Himself. This is, of course, in keeping with the Upaniṣadic maxim—*naiṣā tarkeṇa matirāpaneyā / proktānyanenaiva sujñānāya preṣṭha // Kaṭha Up.* 2.9. Wherein, then lies the fault of the Tantras that invited the vehement criticism from so many directions? The reason was, 'The teachings of the Tantric texts about the five *makāras* must have created very unhealthy and debased state among all classes, particularly the lower orders of the society.' (*Ibid.*, Vol. IV p. 1073). Indeed, the Pāñcarātra ought not to have been placed on par with the cults indulging in the Tantric practices, especially the *Vāmacāra* or *Kaula* cult which owed their origin to the Chinese culture. The basic principle of these is '*Siddhis* or spiritual accomplishments ensue as a result of indulging in those tempting pleasures which normally cause the down fall of human beings.' It must be made clear, that out of the five *makāras* viz. *māṁsa*, *matsya*, *madirā*, *mudrā* and *maithuna* as the ways of worship, the Pāñcarātra accepts only one *i.e.* the *mudrās* which are useful for the *Pujāvidhi*. The *mudrās* aimed at base purpose and *mantras* used for black magic are described in, but not prescribed by the *Pāñcarātra Saṁhitās*.

Now before concluding, it is necesary to recall the close relation between the *Gītā* and the *Pāñcarātra*. The *Gītā* has, indeed, tremendous impact on the thought and literature of the cult. The fact is that the Pāñcarātra has brought into practice, the directive principles suggested in the *Gītā*, especially in giving solace to the Śūdras and women and pointing out to the superior value of the spirit behind the process of worship than that of the pomp in the ceremony. One cannot estimate the difficulties that were to be faced by the veterans of the Pāñcarātra in newly moulding the social life, since they had to do this with no violation of the existing contemporary social frame based on the canons of *Śruti*, *Smṛti* and *Dharmaśāstra*. Leaving aside controversial remarks, one should admit that the Pāñcarātra achieved covetable success in the mission it professed. It so guided the masses, as to form a compact system of religio-social life, a constant flow of civilization through ages. Bearing in mind, that Dharma sustains the society in such a way, as to accomplish both, material and spiritual welfare of the individuals and the group as a whole the sages of the Pāñcarātra, gleaned whatever was useful from all the *Vedas*, the *Smṛtis* and Dharmaśāstra on the one hand and the Tantric and customary practices on the other; they seem to have taken necessary precautions in avoiding, whatever in their view, was not wholesome for the ideal social life.

The *Saṁhitās i.e.* the revealed literature embodying the divine message and the core of culture of this system is indeed very vast, resembling the *Dharmasūtras* and *Dharmaśāstras* obviously on account of the reasons given above, *viz.* for laying down the detailed rules for the conduct of the followers. The contribution of the Pāñcarātra, to the art of temple-construction and iconography is also very significant. On the whole, the litefature has done signal service to the society by enlivening a Supreme God-consciousness, emotional sincerity, purity in conduct and love for humanity at large.

THE CHĀNDOGYA UPANIṢAD AND THE BRAHMASŪTRAS OF BĀDARĀYAṆA— A COMPARATIVE STUDY*

S. M. Bhatkhande

Dr. S. K. Belvalkar in his Gopal Basu Mallik Lectures on Vedānta Philosopy delivered by him in December, 1925, at the Calcutta University, raised the question of "*Chāndogya*" *Brahmasūtras*. The frequent use of the *Chāndogya Udanisad*in the extant *Brahmasūtras* led him to postulate the existence of the '*Chāndogya*' *Brahmasūtras*. In his words, "the majority of the texts that are discussed in the present *Brahmasūtras* hail from the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*. There is nothing improbable in '*Chāndogya*' *Brahmasūtras* having in fact formed the original nucleus of the present sūtras, and been even incorporated therein." A number of other arguments have been given in support of the contention and it is further said that the original *Chāndogya Brahmasūtras* underwent two radical overhaulings and as a result gave rise to the present *Brahmasūtras*. Dr. Belvalkar further points out that Sureśvarācārya in his *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi*, emphatically declares in the first chapter that '*śārīraka*' *sūtra* beginning with the first two sūtras of the present *Brahmasūtras* was actually composed by Jaimini, the reputed author of the *Pūrvamīmāṁsā sūtras*. And "this '*śārīrakasūtra*' may very well have been the postulated *Chāndogya Brahmasūtra*, not only for the reason that both the writer (Jaimini) and the *Upaniṣad* (*Chāndogya*) belong to the *Sāmaveda*, but also for the further reason, that with solitary exception, in all the other references to Jaimini in the *Vedāntasūtras*—where the references are directly to a textual exegesis—we find him discussing passages from the several Prapāṭhakas of just the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*."

These statements have remained so far without any serious examination. Such an examination of the arguments for the existence of the '*Chāndogya*' *Brahmasūtras* was a long felt nece-

---

***Submitted to the University of Bombay in 1975; and published by the University in 1982.**

ssity for all those interested in the study of evolution of the *Brahmasūtras*. The *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* and the *Brahmasūtras* have been studied and commented upon by many scholars, ancient and modern, but so far no attempt has been made to study this problem. Therefore, the present article is written solely with a view to investigating into the claims for the existence of the '*Chāndogya*' *Brahmasūtras*.

Examination of Dr. Belvalkar's views

(*i*) *Earlier Brahmasūtras*

The *Bhagavadgītā* verse :

> " *Ṛṣibhir bahudhā gītam chandobhir vividhaiḥ pṛthak* /
> *Brahmasūtrapadaiś ca eva hetumadbhir viniścitaiḥ* // " XIII.4

clearly refers to earlier philosophical literature discussing the Brahman as the ultimate reality. According to Dr. Belvalkar, the word *Brahmasūtrapadaiḥ* here suggests the existence of many *Brahmasūtra* works. He further thinks that each Vedic Śākhā had its own distinct *Brahmasūtra* as it had its own separate *Śrautasūtra*, *Gṛhyasūtra* and *Dharmasūtra*. These *Brahmasūtra*-works belonging to a particular Caraṇa or Śākhā tried to harmonise the teachings of an *Upaniṣad* or the *Upaniṣads* recognised by that particular Caraṇa. Bādarāyaṇa himself refers to at least six predecessors viz. Ātreya, Āśmarathya, Auḍulomi, Kāśakṛtsna, Kārṣṇājini and Bādari besides Jaimini and himself, and refers to their views on important philosophical matters connected with the Pūrva and the Uttara Mīmāṁsās. Of these predecessors, Kāśakṛtsna, according to Patañjali, appears to have written a treatise on Mīmāṁsā, covering the entire field of the Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā and the Uttara-Mīmāṁsā. All these threads put together, according to Dr. Belvalkar, lead one to accept the existence of many *Brahmasūtra* works earlier than the present *Brahmasūtra* of Bādarāyaṇa. This theory is very intriguing.

Dr. Belvalkar on the strength of the references to the Ācāryas like Ātreya, Āśmarathya, Kārṣṇājini, Bādari, Auḍulomi and Kāśakṛtsna, in both the extant *Pūrva* and Uttara Mīmāṁsā sūtras, thinks that they must have written some treatises on Mīmāṁsā covering the whole field of both the Mīmāṁsās. It may be pointed out here that Auḍolomi and Kāśakṛtsna are both absent in the *Pūrva Mīmāṁsā sūtras* of Jaimini and there seems to be some mistake when Dr. Belvalkar says that Auḍulomi is referred to in the *Pūrva Mīmāṁsā sūtras*. As regards other Ācāryas, Bādari is only mentioned four times in the *Pūrva Mīmāṁsā sūtras* whereas Ātreya is mentioned three times and Kārṣṇājini twice and Āśmarathya only once. Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa are mentioned five times each in the *Pūrva Mīmāṁsā sūtras*. So also references to these Ācāryas in the *Brahmasūtras* are very few. Following is a table which shows the number of references to all these Ācāryas in both the *Mīmāṁsā sūtras* :

Ācārya	*P.M. Sūtras*	*Brahmasūtras*
Ātreya	4.3.18, 5.2.18, 6.1.26	3.4.44
Āśmarathya	6.5.16	1.2.29, 1.4.20,
Kārṣṇājini	4.3.17, 6.7.35	3.1.19
Bādari	3.1.3, 6.1.27, 8.3.6 9.2.33	1.2.30, 3.1.11, 4.3.7, 4.4.10
Auḍulomi	——	1.4.21, 3.4.45, 4.4.6,
Kāśakṛtsna	——	1.4.22
Jaimini	3.1.4 6.3.4 8.3.7 9.2.39 12.1.7	1.4.18, ,3.4.40, 3.2.40, 4.3.12, 3.4.18, 4.4.5, 1.3.31, 3.4.2, 1.2.31, 1.2.28, and 4.4.11,
Bādarāyaṇa	5.2.19, 6.1.8, 10.8.44 11.1.63, 1.1.5	3.4.8, 3.4.19, 4.4.7, 1.3.26, 4.4.12, 3.4.1, 3.2.41, 4.3.15, and 1.3.33

Looking to the surprisingly small number of sūtras in which the names of these Ācāryas occur in the voluminous Pūrva Mīmāṁsā work of 2745 sūtras and *Brahmasūtras* of 555 sūtras, one is inclined to say that this is an inadequate ground to hold that all these Ācāryas wrote extensive works on both the Mīmāṁsās.

One may be inclined to grant the essential supposition of the existence of other *Brahmasūtras* perhaps written by the Ācāryas referred to in the *Brahmasūtras*. But in the absence of any surviving text, it is very difficult to say that there was or was not an attempt to harmonise the teaching of all the *Upaniṣads* or whether such an attempt was a mere personal interpretation of the *Upaniṣads* of thinkers like Āśmarathya, Auḍulomi and others mentioned by Bādarāyaṇa. The mention of many thinkers by Bādarāyaṇa in his *Brahmasūtras* and the possibility of works by Jaimini and Bādarāyaṇa on both the Mīmāṁsās only go to prove that before the present *Brahmasūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa, there were attempts to systematise the philosophical teachings of the *Upaniṣads* and therefore they could be technically described as *Brahmasūtras*. Śaṅkara rightly explains in his comments on the *Bhagavadgītā* 13.4 *Brahmasūtrapadaiḥ* as *Brahmaṇaḥ sūcakāni vākyāni Brahmasūtrāṇi taiḥ padyate gamyate jñāyate Brahma iti tāni padāni* / Since these were efforts to arrive at a system by the thinkers, they introduced logic and commonsense arguments, used accepted principles of interpretation of texts while composing their treatises. It is therefore that the *Bhagavadgītā* describes this *Brahmasūtra* literature as '*hetumat*' and '*viniścita*' against the background of the inspired songs (*gītam*) in different metres (*chandobhiḥ vividhaiḥ*) by the Vedic seers (*ṛṣibhiḥ*). The arguments cannot be stretched beyond this for establishing the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad Brahmasūtra* theory as Dr. Belvalkar propounds. In ancient India any outstanding work of a later period completely supplanted and pushed into oblivion works of lesser merit which had held the ground before it and by way of illustration of this fact one may refer to the *Nāṭyaśātra* of Bharata, *Kāmasūtras* of Vātsyāyana, *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya and *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini, which undoubtedly had literature before them in their respective branches but which also has been completely forgotten, once these works appeared on the scene.

In Dr. Belvalkar's arguments, the *Bhagavadgītā* has an important place but what is the precise relation between the *Bhagavadgītā* and *Sūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa or is the author of the two Prasthānas one and the same ? Late Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak accepts inter-references and inter-dependence and propounds a singleauthorship theory for the *Gītā* and the *Brahmasūtras*. K. T. Telang and others think that the authors of these two works are different and the author of the *Gītā* preceded the author of the *Sūtras*. The third view of Max Muller and others reverses this relation, by holding the author of the *sūtras* as having preceded the author of the *Bhagavadgītā*. Though it is very difficult to give any definite opinion in this matter, there are certain things which deserve consideration in this discussion. Both the *Bhagavadgītā* and the *Brahmasūtras* are Vedānta texts of great importance no doubt, and their importance is indicated by the fact of their being regarded as the two Prasthānas. Similarly, their relationship with the *Upaniṣads* is also beyond doubt. Both appear to be essentially based on the *Upaniṣads* but with a fundamental difference. The Brahman philosophy is accepted in both but the *sūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa try to keep it constantly as distinct from the Sāṁkhya philosophy which indeed they criticise. The *Bhagavadgītā* on the other hand carries out a synthesis of the Brahman philosophy and the Sāṁkhya philosophy of Prakṛti and Puruṣa. The *sūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa appear to think of Brahman on theistic lines (*Sarvopetā ca tad-darśanāt—B.S.*2.1.30) however, faint these lines be, but in the *Bhagavadgītā*, the theistic trends are of paramount importance and this thought dominates over the Vedānta as well as the Sāṁkhya. The *sūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa (*B.S.* 2.3.43) as well as the *Bhagavadgītā* (*B.G.* 15.7) both, accept the *Aṁśa* relationship between the reality, and the soul, an idea which apparently is not supplied by the *Upaniṣads*.

The question of transformation of the impartite reality into the world confronts the Sūtrakāra, which to him is an insoluble problem and he seems to rely on the scriptures '*Śrutes tu śabdamūlatvāt* (*B.S.* 2.1.27). To the author of the *Gītā* it is the glory of the Lord (*Yogam aiśvaram—B.G.* 11.8). Both the *Brahmasūtras* and the *Bhagavadgītā* appear to follow the sādharmya text of the *Upaniṣad*

(*Nirañjanaḥ paramam sāmyam upaiti M.U.* 3.1.3) while speaking of the liberated perfect soul. The style of the *Bhagavadgītā*, which is of epic *anuṣṭubh* versification, indicates lateness, when contrasted with the cryptic style of the Sūtrakāra. It would, therefore, be not altogether wrong to suggest that the *Sūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa depend more or less heavily on the *Upaniṣads* and present the Vedānta in a pure and simple manner and appear to have come first, while the *Bhagavadgītā* which attempts a synthesis of the Upaniṣadic Brahman philosophy, the dualistic Sāṁkhya philosophy and devotional theistic philosophy appears to belong to somewhat late times than the *Sūtras*. In a broad manner, the *Bhagavadgītā* knows the Vedānta of the *Sūtras* but it attempts a synthesis which the *Sūtras* do not attempt. The problem of "*Smaryate sūtras*," one would like to suggest, is made more complicated because the commentators stepped in tradition and always referred to the *Bhagavadgītā* and this has created difficulties. It is quite likely that the *Smṛtis* really hinted at by the Sūtrakāra have not been properly indicated.

(*ii*) *A Chāndogya Brahmasūtra*

It was Deussen who drew attention to the seriatim discussion of the *Upaniṣads* in the *Brahmasūtras*. It is difficult to understand the precise merit of this argument in the context of the theory that Dr. Belvalkar has put forth. In ancient India when texts were orally recited and remembered in their strict order, the *karma* being the most important thing, it is but natural that discussions in the philosophical literature also should have followed this original order. This may indicate that the philosophical works referred to above may have followed the same order of the original texts, a principle very firmly established amongst ancient Indian expositors and also in their educational system and it is hence that one finds the same principle followed by Bādarāyaṇa as well. It is not only that the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* has been discussed in the *Sūtras* in its order but the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* also has been so discussed. It would be difficult to note on this ground of 'order' that "these were preparatory exegetical works within the different Śākhās which were gradually united into a single whole."

Dr. Belvalkar is of the view that Jaimini had composed a *Śārīraka Sūtra* on the authority of the following statement by Sureśwarācārya in his *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi* :

> " *Yadi hi ayam abhiprāyaḥ abhaviṣyat—athāto brahmajijñāsā/Janmādi asya yataḥ/iti-evam-ādibrahmavastu-svarūpamātrayāthātmyaprakāśanaparaṁ gambhīranyāyasaṁdṛbdhaṁ sarvavedāntārtha mīmāṁsanaṁ srīmat-śārīrakaṁ na asūtrayiṣyat*/1.91

Dr. Belvalkar further points out that Jaimini belonged to the *Sāmaveda* to which also belongs the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad.* Further it is significant that whenever Jaimini is referred to in the *Vedānta sūtras*, especially in the matter of interpretation of passages, the passages concerned are from the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad.* From this evidence, Dr. Belvalkar concludes that Jaimini's *Sārīrakasūtra* was a *Chāndogya Upaniṣad Brahmasūtra* and this was bodily incorporated in the present *Brahmasūtras.* It is, therefore, that in the present *Brahmasūtras* (3.3.23) there is a reference to the Khila of the Rāṇāyanīya recension of the *Sāmaveda.*

This is a highly controversial thesis. In the first place, it would not be quite correct to say that the majority of the texts discussed in the present *Brahmasūtras* hail from the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* only. The contribution from the other *Upaniṣads* is equally significant, if not more. Without these *Upaniṣads*, the philosophy of the *Brahmasūtras* would not be complete. Moreover, the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* by itself is not rich enough to sustain a complete structure of a *Brahmasūtra.*

Again if Jaimini's *Śārīrakasūtras* were the *Chāndogya Brahmasūtras*, then the very second sūtra *Janmādyasya yataḥ* (*B.S.* 1.1.2) which defines the highest reality would not presuppose the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad* which belongs to the *Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda.* This is a very strong proof which goes against Dr. Belvalkar's view for he supposes the first two sūtras viz. *Athā' to Brahmajijñāsā* (*B.S.*1.1.1.) and *Janmādyasya yataḥ* (*B.S.*1.1.2) " to be genuine and as belonging to the *Śārīrakasūtras* of Jaimini as referred to by Sureśvarācārya in his *Naiṣkarmyasiddhi.*

It is perfectly natural that Jaimini should be referred to in the matter of interpretation of a text that is being discussed. The principles of interpretation evolved by the Pūrva Mīmāṁsā were accepted by Bādarāyaṇa, as is evident from the Guṇopasaṁhāra pāda (III.iii). After all, the Uttara Mīmāṁsā is a Mīmāṁsā. The orthodox view always accepted the '*aikaśāstrya*' of the Pūrva Mīmāṁsā and the Uttara Mīmāṁsā, and therefore Rāmānuja is seen referring to the Vṛttikāra as observing "*Saṁhitam etat śārīrakaṁ Jaiminīyena ṣoḍaśalakṣaṇena iti śāstraikatvasiddiḥ*" *Srī Bhāṣya* 1.1.1). Therefore it is perfectly natural that the principles evolved by the Pūrva Mīmāṁsā should be used in the Uttara Mīmāṁsā. As has been pointed out the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* passages also are discussed in the *Brahmasūtras*, following their order in the *Upaniṣad*. Thus no undue weight could be attached to the order of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* passages.

(*iii*) *Evolution of the Brahmasūtras* :

Having presumed the possibility of a *Chāndogya Brahmasūtra* by Jaimini, Dr. Belvalkar proceeds to show the evolution of the present *Brahmasūtras* from this hypothetical *Chāndogya Brahmasūtra*. He refers to the fact that normally in the Bādarāyaṇa *Sūtras*, the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* passages are discussed in their order and their continuity is broken only by the discussion of passages from other *Upaniṣads*. But it may be urged in this context that the *Brahmasūtras* discuss passages from the other *Upaniṣads* as well and that these discussions are a sheer necessity for the completion of the Brahman philosophy. At places, the question of a break in the continuity of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* passages does not arise at all, for instance in the '*Janmādyadhikaraṇam*' and the '*Ānandamayādhikaraṇam*' where the *Sūtras* open up their discussion with passages from the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*. The aspects of Brahman discussed by Bādarāyaṇa in these passages are, without doubt, of absolute importance.

According to Dr. Belvalkar the following Pādas and Sūtras will have to be dropped so as to enable one to trace the original *Chāndogya Brahmasūtras* :

I.i.3 and 4

I.ii.5, 6,14,25,26,29 and 30

I.iv.14, 15 and from 23 to 27

II.i. (Smṛtipāda)

II.ii. (Tarkapāda)

II.iii.

II.iv

III.i.3,4,13 to 16, 19 and 20

III.iii (Guṇopasaṁhārapāda)

In short, the whole of the second Adhyāya of the *Brahmasūtras* will have to be dropped besides a number of other sūtras. These total number of sūtras to be dropped according to Dr. Belvalkar is 247. Even after carrying out the pruning as suggested by Dr. Belvalkar what remains in the remaining 308 Brahmasūtras is not 'a pure Chāndogya matter' for Dr. Belvalkar appears to admit the '*Janmādyadhikaraṇam*' and the '*Ānandamayādhikaraṇam*' in his nucleus of the *Brahmasūtras*. In this context, it is very pertinent to quote Dr. Belvalkar himself regarding the pruning operations and reconstruction of the sūtras: "All this would naturally involve extensive reconstruction which it would be much too temerarious to attempt at this date."

Further, the contents of the entire *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* are not rich enough to enable any thinker to arrive at a self-consistent and complete Brahman philosophy. In view of these arguments and in view of the fact that the discussions of passages from other *Upaniṣads* are so vitally connected in the entire structure of the *Brahmasūtras* that it is difficult to think of throwing them out altogether.

Even if accepting for the sake of argument, that Jaimini wrote the *Śāriraka Sūtras*, one is at a loss to understand why he should have restricted himself to the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* only as Dr. Belvalkar argues. Jaimini in his *Pūrva Mīmāṁsā sūtras* has chosen a very wide field of texts. Therefore it would be very difficult to believe that in his *Brahmasūtras* he restricted himself only to the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*. On the other hand, there is a greater possibility of his applying the principles of interpretation to the

Upaniṣads after having formulated them in the *Pūrva Mīmāṁsā Sūtras*. In all likelihood in his *Śārīrakasūtras*. Jaimini must have conceived a wider range than the one contemplated by Dr. Belvalkar. The pruning operation as suggested by Dr. Belvalkar in the context of the *Brahmasūtras* would lead one nowhere and the arguments of break in continuity would only degenerate into a "Washington's axe." What is genuine and what is later often times becomes very difficult to decide. In the matter of *Brahmasūtras* themselves, Dr. Belvalkar assigns Tarkapāda (II.ii) to the latest strata while Jacobi[1] regards it as genuine and proceeds to fix the date of the work on the basis of that reference.

The pruning operations as suggested by Dr. Belvalkar do not help us in any way to trace the original "*Chāndogya Brahmasūtras*." Dr. Belvalkar was perhaps aware of the magnitude of the problem involved when he says "It would be like attempting to reconstruct the original '*Jaya*' from the present '*Mahābhārata*'."[1]

The evolution of the *Brahmasūtras*, if at all there has been one, is perhaps along altogether different lines than those suggested by Dr. Belvalkar. In the first place the system which Bādarāyaṇa was building up, was a Mīmāṁsā, in a sense an application of the Mīmāṁsā principles to the *Upaniṣads* with a view to formulating a coherent and complete Brahman philosophy. As Śaṅkara observes the purpose of the *sūtras* is to knit together the observations of the *Upaniṣads* "*Vedānta-vākya-kusumagrathanārthatvāt sūtrāṇām| Vedāntavākyāni hi sūtraiḥ udāhṛtya vicāryante|*" (*S.B.* on *B.S.* 1.1.2.) This would mean, it had three important aspects :

(*i*) application of Mīmāṁsā principles

(*ii*) securing a coherence of the texts before the author and

(*iii*) completeness as Brahman philosophy.

If this picture of the original conditions has any semblance of a possibility, then the Sūtrakāra, in all likelihood, started with the Catuḥsūtrī declaring his subject Brahman and his aim of Samanvaya of the Sāstras, the Sāstra being the "Yoni" of his thought. This Samanvaya is naturally reflected in the whole of the first Adhyāya where the Śaṅkāvākyas hail from most of the important *Upaniṣads*. In a similar manner, the Adhikaraṇas of the Guṇopasaṁhāra Pāda also point out to this very wider area. Here the different lores (Vidyās) i.e. theories about Brahman, are harmonised. In this Pāda, the application of the Mīmāṁsā principles is obvious. It is on account of this preponderence of the Mīmāṁsā rules utilised in the Samanvaya of the Śāstras, that Pūrva Mīmāṁsā possibly refused to grant an independent status to the Uttara Mīmāṁsā; because the Uttara Mīmāṁsā accepts the principles of interpretation established by the Pūrva Mīmāṁsā and simply applies them to the *Upaniṣads*. The credit of laying down the principles goes to the Pūrva Mīmāṁsā. In this connection, one may also say that the Uttara Mīmāṁsā is seen to be prescribing many Vidhis for the interpretation of the Upaniṣadic texts and for the realisation of Brahman. Śaṅkara examines at length the view of the Brahmavādins according to whom Brahman is the subject of Vidhi according to the scriptures—"*yadyapi śāstrapramāṇakaṁ brahma tathāpi pratipattividhiviṣayatayā eva śāstreṇa brahma samarpyate*/" (*S.B.* on *B.S.*1.1.4). All this would point out that the *Sūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa undertook the study of the *Upaniṣads* more or less on the lines of the Pūrva Mīmāṁsā. These portions, therefore, cannot be taken out of the body of the *sūtras*. Bādarāyaṇa must have in all probability started with these very sections. Finally with a view to completing his Brahman philosophy, the Sūtrakāra in all probability, must have enlisted all the important aspects of Brahman, the world, Ātman, the released soul, the means of salvation and the like, by drawing material from all the *Upaniṣads*. It is in some such way that the *Sūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa must have been planned and worked out.

---

[1] S. K. Belvalkar : Shree Gopal Basu Mallik Lectures on Vedānta Philosophy (1929) p. 145.

If one does not accept Dr. Belvalkar's theory about the evolution of the *Brahmasūtras*, one is compelled to say something about the date of *Bādarāyaṇa Sūtras* or the possible time of their composition. The motive behind the *Brahmasūtras* is clear enough, that of building up a system out of the chaotic but rich material of the *Upaniṣads*. The mind of the Sūtrakāra is also very clearly reflected in the *Sūtras*, a mind seeking harmony and compromise amongst the principal *Upaniṣads* and amongst the earlier thinkers, well-versed in the earlier literature, using terminology from a wider field and going in for quite a number of original *dṛṣṭāntas* for elucidation of his points. The list of items discussed—the concept of reality, the soul, the evolution of the world, the elements and the senses, the deliverence, the means of deliverence and the nature of deliverence—would point out the anxiety of the author to build up a system as complete as possible. This also would show that the Sūtrakāra had a very complete idea of what a system ought to be. There are some other points which deserve attention in this context.

The *sūtras* convey the impression that the author has a Sāṅkhya phobia. Many Adhikaraṇas in the first Adhyāya like Īkṣatyadhikaraṇam, the whole of the fourth pāda of the first Adhyāya, a few Adhikaraṇas refuting the Sāṅkhya position and the Sāṅkhya Smṛtis in the first pāda of the second Adhyāya can be referred to as the instances. Secondly, the author is not prepared to accept the Buddhistic position of a complete analogy between the dream and the waking condition which Gauḍapāda accepts and which is altogether absent in the *Brahmasūtras*. Being essentially an Upaniṣadic thinker, believing in an Absolute cause of the world, the author is naturally led to refute the other atomic systems. This also is perhaps the reason why theistic systems like the Pāśupata have come in for criticism. All this would show roughly the time after the formation of the Hīnayāna and the Mahāyāna Buddhism and an age before the time of Gauḍapāda, when the *sūtras* might have been composed. Bādarāyaṇa appears to stand mid-way between the earlier thought of the *Upaniṣads* and the later thought of Gauḍapāda which teaches the doctrine of Ajātivāda. If some such times are taken as the period when the *sūtras* were composed, one can understand most of the matter of the 16 pādas as a cogent whole.

(*iv*) *Recensions of the Brahmasūtras* :

Dr. Belvalkar has postulated three phases in the evolution of the *Brahmasūtras* viz. (1) the Prātiśākhīya (2) the Sarva-śākhīya and (3) the extant *Brahmasūtras* (with additions of the Pādas like Smṛtipāda, Tarkapāda etc.). It would be difficult to accept this thesis in the light of the arguments made so far. It may be argued that the present *sūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa are a very neatly constructed systematic compendium surveying a very wide field of philosophical literature of the *Upaniṣads* and texts before it and attempting the building up of a systematic and complete philosophy of Brahman. All other lesser efforts if they were there —possibility of the existence of which cannot be denied altogether —are no longer available. But the contribution of these earlier texts to the present text may have been generally only nominal; since Bādarāyaṇa goes to his predecessors not very frequently. He practically goes to all the classical Upaniṣadic texts and it is because of this excellence of his work in point of completeness, that it has not only survived but has become an important Prasthāna of the Vedānta. His *Brahmasūtras* pushed into complete oblivion all other earlier efforts. In view of this darkness that surrounds these earlier efforts, it would be difficult to argue any precise line of evolution or recensions in the matter of these texts. On the other hand one is inclined to believe that this text was created by a person who possessed a true philosophical spirit of compromise, had a very wide outlook, had made a sound study of scriptures before him and possessed a very ambitious mind. This is not to deny the importance of the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* in the history of the Vedāntic philosophy along with the other *Upaniṣad* like the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad, Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad* and the like in general and the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* in particular; the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* has always proved to be a mine of important thoughts to thinkers. It was, therefore, that Brahma-Nandin[2] composed his *Vākyavṛtti* on the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* but this cannot be said in the case of the *Sūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa, for the aim and ambition of Bādarāyaṇa appear to have been quite different from those of the Vākyakāra. The Vākyakāra attempted the exposition of the single text, the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, while the Sūtrakāra attempted the Samanvaya of the Sāstra as he understood it.

Dr. Belvalkar argues a possibility of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad Brahmasūtras* as well. He also refers to the interpretation of the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* passages in 1.4.19-22 in the *Brahmasūtras*. This would really prove very little for a *Brahmasūtra* indeed. It can only mean that the interpretations of the *Upaniṣads* were attempted or were current in the Vedānta circles and this literature would belong to the second philosophical phase to which Āśmarathya, Auḍulomi and other Ācāryas referred to in the extant *Brahmasūtras* belong, a phase that followed the *Upaniṣads* preceded the *Brahma sūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa.

---

[2] Fragments from Brahma-Nandin, M. Hiriyanna (Comm. Essays presented to Prof. Pathak, p. 151)

Dr. Kane's Criticism

Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr. P. V. Kane in his *History of Dharmaśāstra*[3] has made some very relevant and illuminating comments in the context of the theory advocated by Dr. Belvalkar. Dr. Kane obviously had no intentions of going into a detailed examination of the arguments of Dr. Belvalkar but he felt like recording his reactions to Dr. Belvalkar's theory in the following manner :

> " Dr. Belvalkar postulates two propositions viz. that there were *Brahmasūtras* written separately for the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* and the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* and other *Upaniṣads* for each Śākhā and secondly that the *Śārīrakasūtra* of Jaimini was bodily incorporated within and forms the main part of the contents of the present text of the *Brahmasūtra*. The present author takes strong objections to both these propositions. He cannot go into this question at length here but has to remark that these propositions are based on little evidence. If " *Janmādyasya yataḥ* " was also a *sūtra* of Jaimini who was specially connected with the *Sāmaveda* by the *Mahābhārata* and *Purāṇas*, why is it that Sūtra is supposed by the Bhāṣyakāras as based on a passage of the *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*? The *Chāndogya* and *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣads* are each nearly thrice as long as all the other eight *Upaniṣads* (out of the principal ten *Upaniṣads*) and six times longer than the *Tattirīya Upaniṣad*. Therefore, these two *Upaniṣads* figure largely in the discussions in the extant *Brahmasūtra*. The second proposition is hardly more than a pure guess. There is no evidence to establish that the main part of the extant *Vedānta Sūtra* is bodily taken from Jaimini's *Śārīrakasūtra* when the latter has not come down to us and when no sūtras therefrom (other than the two noted above) are quoted anywhere as from Jaimini's *Śārīraka Sūtra*."

---

[3] Vol. V., Part-II (1962) pp., 1175-76.

Conclusion

Thus it will be seen that the Sūtrakāra had a very broad concept of 'Śāstra.' He intended to carry out a Samanvaya. He also wanted to build-up a very neat and complete Brahman philosophy and at the same time to keep close to the Upaniṣads as much as possible. The Upaniṣadic material is really the warp and the woof of the *Sūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa and it cannot be separated by any pruning operations nor can be restricted to any single philosophical text of whatever importance. His terminology comes from a very wide field. He presumes so many texts and is acquainted with thinkers who were his predecessors. He is an original thinker. One is therefore tempted to conclude that in the *Sūtras* of Bādarāyaṇa, we have essentially an Upaniṣadic homogeneous work as neat as possible dealing with Brahman philosophy. It is very difficult to accept Dr. Belvalkar's contentions in this respect. The conclusion drawn by the author receives an unequivocal support in Dr. Kane's views presented casually in the *History of Dharmaśāstra*.

DVAITA SCHOOL OF VEDĀNTA*

V. B. INAMDAR

THE *Brahmasūtra* of Bādarāyaṇa, which claims to be a summary of the philosophical thoughts of the *Upaniṣads*, is the common source of all the systems of Vedānta. Among them the Advaita of Śrī Śaṅkara figures most prominently, so much so that there are scholars outside India who have equated the Indian philosophy with the Advaita of Śaṅkara. His commentary on the *Brahmasūtra* ushered a new era in the field of philosophy. His monistic interpretation of the *Brahmasūtra* created an awakening in various quarters—some of which became almost restless. They could not accept that the illusionistic monism was the gist and tenor of the scriptures. There arose several reactions to it, some of which were very sharp and powerful. The Bhedābheda, the Viśiṣṭādvaita, the Dvaitādvaita, the Dvaita, the Śuddhādvaita—all sprang from the common source of the *Brahmasūtra* and attacked the Advaita ideology. The founders of these systems wrote commentaries on the *Brahma sūtra* and explained it in ways that suited their own ideologies. But when we look back, we find that the Dvaita school of Śrī Madhva outshone the others and became the chief rival of the Advaita. The others, with the exception of the Viśiṣṭādvaita of Rāmānuja, almost withered away for want of vitality and resourcefulness. Considering the energy and the vitality with which the Dvaita school carried on the battle and also the quantity and quality of literature that it produced, we can be justified in saying that the Advaita of Śaṅkara and the Dvaita of Madhva are the main occupants of the field of Vedānta.

The Dvaita theory is a direct anti-thesis of the Advaita which is characterised by speculative boldness, while the Dvaita, by logical realism. It refuses to believe in the assumptions of the Advaita such as illusion, fontal nescience, superimposition, vitiating adjuncts and the resultant diversity, illusory nature of the empirical world, degrees of reality, indescribability of the world, monism of the ultimate principle etc. etc.. The Dvaita school ascribes these to the Buddhistic influence and calls Śaṅkara a crypto-Buddhist (*pracchanna-bauddha*), though it can be proved that they are derived from the Upaniṣadic statements like *vācārambhaṇam vikāro nāmadheyam* etc. (*Ch. Up.*). The Dvaita-Advaita controversy has no equal in any other field of knowledge in our country. The war of words has been going on for over six centuries. The principal aim of the Dvaita school is to attack and demolish the Advaita theory. This sets the norm of writing in the Dvaita school which contains furious onslaughts on rival schools.

---

*Submitted to the University of Poona in 1963.

Misnomer :

The name Dvaita and its English rendering—Dualism—are both misnomers. They suffer from the first of the three faults of definition viz. *Avyāpti* i.e. inadequacy of pervasion. They do not convey the full significance of Madhva's theory. They are popular mainly because they declare an emphatic opposition to the Advaita of Śaṅkara. Several Dvaita scholars have suggested alternative titles, but none of them is quite satisfactory as there is in them little beyond shifting the emphasis from one aspect of this Vedānta to the other.

Shri Venkatrao Alur has suggested *Poorṇa-Brahma* as the title. But it does not convey any special meaning to the general reader to whom it can well mean the Brahman of the monist, because nowhere does the Advaitin even suggest that his ultimate principal is *a-poorṇa* or imperfect. Whether his reasoning can sustain the claim is a different matter altogether. By *poorṇa*, Shri Alur means *guṇa-poorṇa* i.e. possessing all the auspicious qualities, but for getting this special meaning, the reader has to wade through several chapters of his book ! *Saguṇa-Brahman* would have been a slightly better name as it would also indicate its opposition to the *Nirguṇa-Brahman* of the Advaitin.

The Swamiji of the Pejawar Maṭha holds that *Tattva-vāda* is the correct name. But one can easily see that it is too general to be applied to any particular system exclusively. Prof. H. N. Raghavendrachar prefers *Brahmādvaita*, because in his and other view the Advaitins' Brahman is no more than a *śūnya*, void and it is only the Dvaitin's Brahman that has a real existence, independence and supremacy. The name *Brahmādvaita*, however, can also be applied with full justice to the theories of Rāmānuja and Vallabha.

Dr. B. N. K. Sharma has proposed *svatantra-advitīya-brahma-vāda* as the most suitable name for this Vedānta. It certainly is not *quite* suitable. Firstly it is clumsy and secondly, it can also describe the Advaita of Śaṅkara, because his Brahman also is *svatantra* i.e. independent and *advitīya* i.e. one without a second. Dr. Sharma, however, argues that his words have to be understood in a different way. He says that *svatantra*, by implication, would point to the *asvatantra* or *paratantra* viz. *Jīva* and *Jaḍa* and in a like manner the word *advitīya* "has been interpreted by Madhva in his *Chāndogya-Bhāṣya*, in terms of 'absence of a peer and superior' to Brahman, conceding, by implication, the existence and reality of 'lesser reals' like Matter and Souls, under the aegies of God", (*History of the Dvaita School of Vedānta*, vol. I, p. 7). But it must be pointed out here that the word *Advitīya* from the *Chāndogya* is interpreted in this sense by *none* except Madhva. Why take the word *dvitīya* in the sense of 'peer or superior' which is not its usual but only an exceptional sense? Dr. Sharma's defence viz., 'The denial of a second would more naturally refer to an equal or a rival rather than to inferior realities', (*ibid.*, p. 239) does not at all stand because the word *bahu* in the next sentence of the passage in question throws enough light on the intention of the *Śruti* viz. that the original principle wished to be just *many* (*bahu syām prajāyeya* etc.). Where is the question of a rival or a superior? Moreover, it is unnatural that the *Śruti* would resort to implication rather than expression on such an important point as the initial stages of creation by the fundamental category of existence. But, even if we grant, for the sake of argument, that the words in question mean all these things, still the title would cover only half the field, as, its chief emphasis would be only on the supremacy of the Brahman, ignoring the other important aspect of the doctrine viz. the reality and the non-identity with the Brahman of the other categories of existence as opposed to their unreality in the *Māyā-vāda*. In fact this latter was the mainspring of Madhva's theory as its chief aim was to demolish monism. Any name, therefore, that we suggest for this system must have a clear and direct, bearing on this fundamental aspect of Madhvaism. Hence, Dr. Sharma's name also is not adequately expressive.

If at all we are to bring all the important features of this Vedānta in its name, we shall have to coin some such name as *saguṇa-brahmādhīna-satya-jīva-jagad-vāda* (i.e. the theory of the real animate and inanimate world depending on the Brahman possessed of (auspicious attributes). But this would certainly be a very clumsy title. Compared to the titles discussed above the name Dvaita, that way, is very handy and has the force of usage behind it. It also strikes the note of 'Difference' (*bheda*) between the *svatantra* and the *asvatantra* realities—as against the *abheda* non difference—in the Advaita. Hence, the title Dvaita, though deficient in many respects, is preferable to all the other titles.

Dvaita theory of Knowledge

The Dvaita-Advaita controversy is mainly epistemological. The Dvaita thinkers have all along tried to show that pure monism of an attributeless noumenon is epistemologically untenable. For showing this they have developed the theory of *Saviśeṣa abheda*, which explains the onto-epistemological problem of the relation between substance and attribute.

The term substance refers to the ontological aspect of things, while the term attribute refers to the epistemological aspect. We cannot think or talk of a thing unless we know it and what we know of it are its attributes. It is impossible to think of an absolutely attributeless thing, though for argument's sake we have to say that a thing like substance must be existing because the attributes must have some substratum to reside. Or, we can put it in the other way—things are what they are in themselves and it is we who make the distinction as substance and attribute. Nature may not be designing substances and attributes separately. The ways in which the thing called substance appears to us are its attributes while both, in reality, are one. For explaining this relation between the two the Dvaitins bring in their doctrine of *viśeṣa* or particularity which makes distinction without difference.

Viśeṣa is defined as the thing that makes possible the knowledge and usage of difference in a thing which does not possess differences (*Nyāya-sudhā*, p. 106). 'Being itself" is not a different attribute of thing. Thingness and the thing are really the same and yet differently called, as the suffix 'ness' must have some purpose. The Advaitins also say that the Jīva and the Brahman are non-different, though they are differently named. Difference cannot be different from the differing things. Otherwise, we shall have to assume another difference between the first difference and the differing things and so on *ad-infinitum.* To obtain the knowledge of a thing we have to assume its difference from other things. If we do not cognise this difference, the knowledge of the thing will never result. But this difference cannot be cognised as apart and distinct from the thing. All theorists have ultimately to accept a state in which the thing and its difference i.e. substance and attribute are distinct yet not different. This is *saviśeṣa abheda.* How are the substance and attribute related? To attempt the least objectionable reply, the idea of *Viśeṣa* is formulated. It is a *via media* between the absolute oneness and absolute difference between the two (also between the Vaiśeṣika and the Advaita views).

The *Viśeṣa* is '*svanirvāhaka*' (ibid, p. 107). It performs a double function, one positive, that of distinguishing and the other negative, that of not differentiating. Substance and attribute, thus, are one yet distinct. Owing to *Viśeṣa* there is no failure of their relation. It is of the very nature of things and by its peculiar power it relates itself to the relata and the relata to each-other (*svanirvāhaka*). It, therefore, does not require another *viśeṣa* to relate it to the relata. Each thing has as many particularities (*viśeṣas*) as the ways in which we can deal with it. These cannot be enumerated, hence they are *ananta.* Each is distinct from the other and is knowable by perception and presumption (i.e. inference according to Dvaita).

The theory of *Viśeṣa* has been particularly used to disprove the *samavāya* of the Vaiśeṣikas and the *Akhaṇḍārtha* theory of the Kevalādvaita. The Dvaitins argue that the differenceless Brahman is talked of as *ananta* in the *Śruti* in the sense of the *ananta viśeṣas.* The Upaniṣadic statement *ekamevādvitīyam* etc. also means that the Lord and His attributes are one only. *Neha nānāsti* etc. means that there is no difference between them and *Mṛtyoḥ sa mṛtyum* etc. means that he who differentiates between them goes to hell. The Advaitin may urge that the question of *Viśeṣa* does not arise, as attributes are the result of illusion, while the real substance, the Brahman is attributeless. The Dvaitin would reply that an attributeless thing is an unknowable thing—a mere void. Its realisation is an impossibility and so, Mokṣa cannot result from it.

The Dvaitins also postulate the theory of *Bheda* which is allied to the doctrine of *Viśeṣa*. *Bheda* or difference is of the very nature of a thing and is established by the very knowledge of the thing since it is known as being different from the rest. Otherwise no knowledge (of any thing) will result. The whole world will appear as an undifferentiated, uniform, monolithic mass of matter. If knowledge of a thing does not consist of its difference from the rest, then, one may even doubt oneself to be a jar (all unity and no difference) but such a doubt never arises. Even for the rise of doubt, cognition of things is necessary and cognition means awareness of the things as distinguished from the rest. Therefore all knowledge is rooted in difference i.e. *Bheda*. If difference is not accepted, all talk would be a mere repetition. Hence, difference is real. *Bheda* cannot be known by itself, as it involves an unacknowledged reference to the correlates, but it does not lose its nature on that account. Even the Advaitin, by admitting the unity of God and the soul, has indirectly accepted difference between them.

Bheda is foundational to the Dvaita ideology. Owing to emphasis on the exclusion-aspect, it may appear to be bordering on the Buddhist view of Apoha. But there is a great difference between them. The Buddhist Apoha tells us only what the thing is not while the Dvaitin's *Bheda* tells us that everything has an individuality and this latter presupposes the things different from the rest. *Bheda* is, thus, neither different from nor the same as the thing itself. The Dvaitin very significanlty calls it *saviśeṣa abheda*—identity in difference. Our knowledge of thing is invariably of this form. Pure monism is a fiction as it is not epistemologically tenable. The conditions under which the human mind can work clearly show that knowledge is a separating process. Only we are not specially cognisant of those other things as we concentrate our mind on the thing with which we are concerned. Here, the question gets related to the determinate and indeterminate perceptions. The Advaita believes that the mind can reach a stage in which it forgets everything else and passes into a deobjectified state or trance. The Dvaita thinks that such a state is nothing but a sterilisation of the mind, a veritable death. Realisation of such a state can never mean Mokṣa.

Some more epistemological ideas of the Dvaitins are as follows : Knowledge has no form of its own. It assumes the form of the thing which is its object. Knowledge is the container and the object is the content. Attributes of objects form the content of knowledge. Objectless knowledge is a fiction. The subject and object of knowledge cannot merge into one. No flight of imagination can grasp such a state. The fact that a thing is known proves that it has attributes. An attributeless thing is an unreal thing. Realisation of such a thing (e.g. Advaitin's Brahman) is an epistemological impossibility. Knowledge is always exclusive. It cannot exist without an awareness of its difference from the rest. This rules out absolute monism. An attempt to pass into an undifferentiated state is against the nature of being. It amounts to passing into non-existence. Pursuit of an unknowable thing is like the pursuit of mirage. It cannot bring about the development of personality and the ultimate release.

Whatever is known by a *pramāṇa* is real in every sense. Whatever is not established and cannot be established by any of the three *pramāṇas* is unreal. Such a thing cannot and need not be taken into consideration. *Pratyakṣa* is the supporting *upajīvya pramāṇa.* Its results cannot be invalidated by any other *pramāṇa* (including *śruti*). Validity is innate to all cognitions, invalidity is extrinsic. Our cognitions are normally valid, it is foolish to regard them as always deceptive and *māyāmaya.* For the validity of all forms of knowledge *Sākṣin* is the ultimate authority. Knowledge is inert, yet self-illumined and self-evident. The same knowledge, at the same moment, cannot be apprehended by more than one *pramāṇa.*

Only real things can be denied or affirmed. Presence or absence of unreal things makes no sense. There are no degrees of reality, there are only degrees of attributes. That is a real principle by the knowledge of which one is able to make the affirmation 'It is'. Whatever is real is knowable. There are ten categories of ultimate reals and twenty substances in the entire *saṁsāra* (existence). God, the souls and the matter are eternally different from each-other and in themselves. The difference is five-fold and canot be merged even in Mokṣa. Unity is false, difference is real. Jīva is the ontological aspect of the Ātman while the Sākṣin is the epistemological one ; both are eternal and inalienable, even in Mokṣa. God is the only independent, ultimate reality. He is *saguṇa*, not *nirguṇa*. He veils the souls with Nescience i.e. Avidyā and removes the veil when pleased with them by their devotion. Mokṣa is the enjoyment of happiness in the company of God, not one-ness with Him. The world is real, the things in it are real and our knowledge of them is real.

The World and the Brahman

The Dvaita and the Advaita schools are diametrically opposed to each other in their views regarding the world and the Brahman. Their opposition naturally stems from their epistemological differences. The Advaitin boldly launches his idea of *anirvacanīyatva* or *sadasadvilakṣaṇatva* i.e. illusoriness of the world and the idea of the degrees of reality. Looking at the world from the standpoint of ultimate reality he maintains that the world is neither *sat* nor *asat* and hence is *mithyā* or illusory which is the same as *anirvacanīya*. It has only *Vyāvahārika sattā* i.e. empirical reality while the attributeless Brahman alone has *Pāramārthika sattā* i.e. ultimate reality. The Dvaitin vehemently attacks these positions. He argues that according to the law of excluded middle, a thing is either existent or non-existent, there is no middle course. The world cannot be other than real and unreal. The Advaitin says that the third possibility can be proved by inference and we need not insist on its sense-perception. It is a mere judgement, a decision ; since a thing is neither this nor that, it must be other than both and this can be proved only by inference.

The crux of the problem is that the Dvaitin is trying to put within the range of perception what is mainly negative in character. The concept of *anirvacanīyatva* ultimately resolves itself into negation of everything. The moment it is touched with thought and analysed, it melts away into nothingness. The concept would land us in nihilism (when coupled with the attributelessness of the Brahman) and the charge of being a *Pracchanna Bauddha* can hardly be averted by the thin defence that the Buddhist emphatically denies everything while the Advaitin indirectly means as much by the backdoor of *Anirvacanīyatva* (and also attributelessness). It is this that the Dvaitin resents very much. He is not prepared to believe in things that are beyond the range of experience and the *pramāṇas.* Even if such a thing exists, says he, it is as good or as bad as not existing, because we have no means to prove its existence and no way to reach it. It is useless to talk about it.

Upon this the Advaitin says that this charge of the Dvaitin would be correct so far as the phenomenal world is concerned. He argues that the phenomenal world is not all. It is made -up of things which experience shows to be unstable. Nothing that we see shows signs of real permanency as everything is imperceptibly undergoing a constant change. Are we still to believe in the reality and the finality of things? By a bold stretch of imagination he suggests that everything in the world is finite and evanescent. So, finiteness and evanescence go together. The world is a finite reality (*Vyāvahārika sattā*). There must, therefore, be some infinite reality which must necessarily be attributeless, if evanescence, the concomitant of attribute, is to be avoided. To realise this we must transcend all difference, the cognate of attributes, and seek unity with that state. The Advaitin does not want to check the flight of his thoughts by the barriers of amenability to sense-perception and all that. He formulates the idea of the veil of Avidyā which seperates the soul from the Brahman like the poet's *cakravāka* and *cakravākī* separated by a single lotus-leaf at night-fall. The veil of Avidyā confines and conditions the soul. When this bondage is thrown away Mokṣa comes. Thus, according to the Advaita, on the way of Mokṣa, there is more of abandoning than of acquiring. From the attributeful state to the attributeless state—that is his idea of real progress. In the usual state of the mind, this seems impossible, because, apprehension of an attributeless thing does not fit in with our method of knowledge. That is why he is particular about the *Nirvikalpa pratyakṣa.* He asks us not to turn away from such a position. It is true that the mind would cease to work in such a state, but that need not mean that there is nothing beyond that state. All theorists have imagined things which are supra-sensuous and the Dvaitin is no exception to this. What guarantee is there that there is God and He is Lord Viṣṇu and that He has a consort named Ramā as the Dvaitins imagine? Why this craze for putting everything in the familiar way of knowledge and familiar terms? There might be something beyond what the human mind can reach. Our inability to apprehend an attributeless thing may prove the crisis of human knowledge, and the so-called contradiction in the *anirvacanīyatva* may prove the crisis of human language. Language cannot keep pace with thought and when we are confronted with such abstract notions as mere existence and non-existence, the expression that we use sometimes creates new difficulties. What we regard as contradiction and inconsistency often belongs to *our* comprehension and expression of the thing while the thing, in its transcendental glory, defies all efforts at its comprehension. The mind and the senses fall short of the goal which is super-sensuous (*ati-gambhīram bhāvayāthātmyam.*)

To the Dvaitin all this is bosh and non-sense. He finds enough material in this to laugh at. He does not wish to go to any such land of chimeras. Whatever is possible with the make-up of our mind should form the object of our endeavour. Even the thought that there is something beyond the mind is the product of the mind itself and the so-called indescribability is also described in human language ; if at all any such thing exists, it will have to be perceived with this very mind and described in this very language. If the world is false, you and I will be false, our thoughts will be false, the Brahman and Mokṣa also will be false. The Brahman has every chance of being real only if our mind, which is the means of knowing it, is real and its cognitions are real.

The two positions are, thus, irreconcilable. The Advaita inclines towards imagination, The Dvaita, towards realism. The two can never meet. The question of superior and inferiror is irrelevant as both are fundamental positions showing two opposite tendencies in the Indian Philosophical thought.

BUDDHISM AS PRESENTED BY THE BRAHMANICAL SYSTEMS*

(late) CHITRAREKHA KHER

Introduction :

THE systems of Indian philosophy represent the attempts at a logical explanation of the problem of reality and a reasoned interpretation of spiritual experiences. These systems, though differ among themselves in their approach to the problem of reality, their outlook to the ways of life is more or less homogeneous. The acceptance of the authority of the *Vedas*, the four stages of life (Āśramas), the division of society into classes (Varṇas), the prominence accorded to householder's state as the backbone of social life, a positive outlook towards the world, the life and its manifold activities, these are some of the features shared in common by these systems which mark them out from Buddhism. The followers of these systems lived in unison, as constituents of a harmonious social order, Brahmanism, which stands for a commonly accepted tradition in the social, the economic, the philosophical and the cultural spheres. The exponents of the Brahmanical systems of philosophy accepted this particular culture and hence their common grounds are suggested by the term Brahmanism in distinction from the Buddhists.

Buddhism signified right from its origin a negative attitude in different fields. In the beginning it stood against the sacrificial and ritualistic practices, highly prevalent in the society at large, against the distinction among men based on four social classes such as the Brāhmaṇas, the Kṣatriyas and the like. It sponsored monk-ideal as the symbol of good life. In philosophy, Buddhism advocated the denial of soul, of theory of causation, of god, of positive joy etc.. It is notable that Buddhism denied '*jāti*' not only in social scheme but also in the philosophical sphere.

---

* **Submitted to the University of Poona in 1969.**
(Paper prepared from the thesis by Nalinee Chapekar.)

There is no doubt that the Buddhist thinkers arrived at these conclusions by a consistent use of stern logic, but they provoked a strong reaction from the Brahmanical side. Buddhist thinkers sponsored philosophy and ethical religion, which had not much to give back to secular life of the society. From the economic point of view of the society, it was a non-productive section depending for its existence on the work and charity of the people. There were also ample instructions and rules for the life of a renunciate. But the householder who professed faith in Buddhism had to fall back upon Brahmanical ways of life for all matters excepting his faith.

The religious and social life of the Brahmanical society was inseperably connected through the authority of the *Vedas.* The Buddhist opposition to the *Vedas*, therefore, signified an opposition to the Brahmanical social order. The real issue of opposition is more comprehensive which lies in the positive and negative attitude favoured by these two sets of systems. The six orthodox systems of Indian philosophy have waged a fierce and continuous intellectual warfare with the Buddhists. In the philosophical literature one sees Buddhist's view, stated as the Pūrvapakṣa, under a general name such as Saugata, Śākyamata and the like and then its criticism. In the presentation of Buddhism, the Brahmanical authors centered their attention on only four schools of Buddhist thought viz. the Vaibhāṣika, the Sautrāntika, the Vijñānavāda and the Śūnyavāda. Looking to the history of Buddhism it is clear that Buddhism in its early and later form covers an 'unending and complicated series of philosophical schools, sects and subsects.' The fourfold classification of the Buddhist schools by the Brahmanical systems was not all the result of a purposeful selection. The Brahmanical authors do not appear to entertain a conviction that this was the classification supported by Buddhist works. They know the Buddhist belief that Buddha's teachings were modified according to dictates of necessity, but on the other hand, they do not display any knowledge of the varieties of the Buddhist schools. They are rather more concerned with the views of a particular Buddhist author and his written words.

Theory of Universal Momentariness :

The theory of universal momentariness is the archstone of most of the epistemological, metaphysical and logical theories of the Buddhists as presented by the Brahmanical systems. The idea of momentariness seems to have been suggested from the evanescent nature of the cognition, the sound, changes in the living body through its growth and decay, the lamp flame etc. and the same reasoning is applied to apparently stable objects. Things coming into being use their causal material every moment and hence the same thing is different every moment. Since there is no accumulation of such things it is derived that the thing is destroyed every moment. Perception as well as the act of destruction proves momentariness. Dharmakīrti states that whatever exists is momentary, because it is causally efficient (Arthakriyākāri). Real is that which truly exists and the Buddhist decides upon causal efficiency as the mark of reality. The causal function is executed in a moment and after that a thing has no purpose or function. A naturally efficient entity produces it's effect immediately when it itself comes into existence and hence not functioning in the second moment as nothing is left to be done, it is as good as non-existent.

Closely related with the theory of momentariness is the issue of causality. According to Buddhists causation is a self-motivated process based on invariable dependence. They account for the rise of dissimilar effects by stating that a change in the totality of causal conditions leads to a difference of effects.

The Brahmanical authors try to refute the theory of momentariness chiefly by means of the following arguments—arguments showing the impossibility of causal relation and production; arguments pertaining to the causeless destruction leading to momentariness; arguments against the perception of momentariness; arguments for recognition as a perceptional proof of the enduring character of things; arguments against the absence of an eternal identical agent, enjoyer and knower, who gets entangled in the worldly existence, transmigrated and through efforts attains Final Release. From the point of view of the Indian systems, each of which starts as the exposition of the way to

Final Release, ability to explain these three facts in the most convincing and consistent manner is the criterior of success. It is to be noted that almost all the Brahmanical philosophers regard it a failure on the part of Buddhism that owing to momentariness, the main plank of its philosophical structure is displaced because the one who is in bondage and the one who is to be released are absolutely different and the inspiration for efforts is lost.

Vijñānavāda :

The Brahmanical systems describe that according to Vijñānavāda there is no apprehension of the distinctive forms of the cognition and of the object and since our cognition is a fact of direct perception, whatever form appears must be supposed to be that of the cognition. Therefore, there is nothing like the form of an object apart from cognition. It is stated that the object depends for its being on the cognition, while there is cognition as in dream etc. eventhough there is no object. Cognition is self-luminous. The object cannot be cognised unless there is some manifesting agency. But cognition can manifest the object. That which is non-different from the cognition alone can be cognised. The object is cognised. Therefore, object and cognition are identical. An object is established in accordance with the cognition and the two are invariably simultaneously apprehended, which proves their identity. The Vijñānavādin claims that the mental alone is real and the physical cannot be real. There is no external reality which operates as a causal factor in determining our cognitions. The causal factors of sensation as well as cognition are exhausted by items within the knower.

The Vijñānavāda is severly criticised by the Brahmanical authors because the denial of the reality of external objects and the assertion of the sole reality of momentary consciousness appeared revolutionary to them. The Vijñānavādin doubts the very validity of perception while every Brahmanical critic of the Vijñānavāda puts on equally heavy reliance on perception. It is argued that the reality of external objects is proved by perception. Most of the Brahmanical systems assume that things can be known as they really are and that what is distinct in thought is distinct in existence. They argue that mind is distinct from the object of its knowledge and that there is no priority of mind over the objects of its knowledge. They say that being is independent of knowing. Knowledge is not the same as 'making' an object. It is a direct and immediate revelation of the external object. The Vijñānavāda has pointed out that the existence of cognition is not a sufficient ground to prove the independent existence of the physical world. But the upholders of the reality of external world unanimously argue that when we have a cognition of something blue, yellow, the cognition is related to something external. There is no problem as to how cognition can be related with an object different from itself because the very rise of cognition signifies that it is related to the external. The object exists in the same sense as the cognition exists. The object has the same nature, both when we know it and also when we do not know it. Knowing makes no difference in the object. It is pointed out that the Vijñānavāda argument rests on a confusion between the truism that I cannot know anything to exist without its being known by me and the falsehood that it cannot exist without being known by me. The argument, therefore, is far from proving that whatever we know depends for its existence on our or some other minds' knowing it, nor does it even prove that everything existent is knowable or known but only that everything known is known.

Śūnyavāda :

The Śūnyavāda is understood or rather misunderstood consciously or unconsciously, by the Brahmanical systems. The literal meaning of the word 'Śūnya' which signifies a void or 'absolute' non-existence has been perhaps, responsible for this misunderstanding. It is also not improbable that the fact that the Mādhyamikas stressed the negative method of pointing out to the reality by refusing to clad it in any verbal description and that they remained satisfied with their ability to deny the objective and the subjective categories was the cause of an absence of right view about the system. Therefore, many Brahmanical writers present and criticise Śūnyavāda as little short of scepticism and self-condemned nihilism.

The Mādhyamikas viewed that the objects of knowledge cannot be proved because there are no independent valid Pramāṇas. The Sarva-Śūnyatā is proved by pointing out that nothing exists because entities are non-existent in other forms. All things are known to be mere negations of one-another. The terms denoting things are co-ordinate with non-existence. The things cannot be proved to have their own nature because their own nature is relative, that is, it depends on something else. Since things are interdependent and since to depend upon something else is to have no nature of one's own (svabhāva), they must be without any nature i.e. void.

The Brahmanical systems condemn Śūnyavāda as a system which does not even deserve to be criticised. It is argued that Śūnyavāda cannot be proved. Things have got their own nature. All things cannot be non-entities, because by virtue of their nature, things really exist. Distinctions of things caused by their nature are actually experienced. Since things have got their own nature, even though they are thought of or they are not thought of in the context of other things, they continue to exist as they are. Against the denial of Pramāṇas, it is argued that since all Pramāṇas are denied, the denial itself cannot be logically proved. The Mādhyamikas have no right to criticise others unless they themselves accept a scheme of Pramāṇas.

Soul and Nirvāṇa :

The doctrine of eternal soul, favoured by the Brahmanical systems, with some differences as regards its nature, is an anathema for the Buddhists. All the Brahmanical writers make explicit this position of the Buddhists and it is also to be seen from their presentations that the doctrine of soul is intrinsically connected with the theory of universal flux and the denial of substance as an ultimate category apart from the qualities. The Buddhists reject the reality of soul on the ground that the functions supposedly attributed to soul can well be performed by the continuum of momentary consciousness and there is no necessity of postulating a soul, especially when it is not apprehended by any means of knowledge. The facts of agency and enjoyment (Kartṛtva and Bhoktṛtva) are incompatible with the eternal and all pervading character of the soul, because they signify change and movement. That means the soul becomes liable to destruction and finite if he were to act and enjoy. There can be no real agency of act and enjoyment if the soul suffers no change of states etc. and is as good as a non-entity. The soul is not produced and is uncaused. Therefore, it is non-existent. The soul is a conceptual construction. What is looked upon as a soul is only a bundle of different elements called 'Skandhas'. The notion of soul is a perverted notion. There is no necessity of postulating a soul different from the momentary psychoses. It is the consciousness-continuum which transmigrates and is reborn.

All Brahmanical systems understand Buddhism as a stern antagonist of the doctrine of soul. From the Brahmanical point of view, denial of soul constitutes the original sin of Buddhism. What is it that gets entangled in the world and empirical existence, acts and enjoys and then becomes free? This is really a puzzling question from the first for the Buddhist and the one for which he has failed to find a convincing reply. Brahmanical authors rightly point out that the denial of soul implies an outrage on the spiritual ambitions and potentialities of man and cannot be made-up by any amount of ethical perfection or intellectual and mental achievements. It is a fault which simply cannot be forgiven. According to the Brahmanical thinkers, Buddhism displays highest discrepancy on this point when it assumes that there is no persisting soul and yet goes on talking of freedom. The Buddhists reply that the continuum of discrete momentary flashes of consciousness which is somehow identical through time does not satisfy them.

The Brahmanical critics of Buddhism present three main strands in the concept of Nirvāṇa. According to one, the rise of the continuum of pure consciousness free from Vāsanās and Kleśas constitutes Nirvāṇa. Here, the existence of consciousness in post-Liberation state is assumed. The second concept is the attainment of Śūnya. This has been found difficult to be deciphered on the background of the denial of soul and the knowledge by the Mādhyamikas. Brahmanical critics have not, however, hesitated to identify it with pure non-existence. The third concept is of the destruction of everything including consciousness where the personality is wiped away and no residue remains in the post-Liberation state. This becomes clear when it is considered in the context of the Buddhist denial of soul. It can be well compared with the absolute annihilation of life 'Offered' by simple materialism, the only difference being that of time and efforts, as Stcherbatsky observes in his concept of Nirvāṇa.

Pramāṇas :

According to Buddhists there are only two Pramāṇas perception and inference. The theory of perception has been an issue of furious controversy between Buddhism and the Brahmanical systems, due to their different metaphysical theories. Diṅnāga school builds its metaphysics on the basis of the theory of knowledge and highly emphasises the distinction of the objective and the subjective in the theory of perception. According to Diṅnāga, Nirvikalpaka and Savikalpaka are not varieties of perception but of knowledge as such. The one is direct and immediate knowledge of the thing as it is and the other is always subsequent to the former, indirect and mediate. The division is based on the law of contradiction and hence each is opposed to the other in every respect. Determinate cognition is a comprehensive category which includes every form of knowledge other than valid perception viz. inference, illusion, hallucinations and wrong cognitions. Out of them, inference alone is a valid means of knowledge, because the indirect but invariable connection with the real can be definitely ascertained there through the Mark. Since inference is based on the generalised aspect of the object it is said that owing to this feature inference shares the character of Vikalpajñāna.

Among the Brahmanical systems, the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣka, the Pūrva-Mīmāṁsā schools and the Śāṁkhya look upon indeterminate and determinate perceptions as two kinds of valid perception, with a distinctive difference of vividness and sequence. The Brahmanical philosophers rely on perception on experience of the common man and on Vṛddhavyavahāra. The Buddhist tries to analyse perception, by challenging as to how far every perception can be relied as valid. The Vijñānavādins class the perception of external objects under illusion from a transcendental point of view and both the Śūnyavādins and the Vijñānavādins favour the distinction of the empirical and the transcendental truth. The Nyāya-Vaśiesika and the Pūrva-Mimāṁsā reject the distinction of truth and try to deal with all problems on the plane of normal experience. But this forces on them the assumptions of the reality of the categories like Sāmānya, Samavāya, Abhāva etc. .

Other Points :

Apoha—Diṅnāga pointed out that neither individual nor universal, nor their relation nor again the individual qualified by universal can be the meaning of the word. Negation of not-that constitutes the meaning of word which is purely negative. Individuals cannot form the subject matter of verbal convention because they are momentary and infinitive. But the percepts of individuals give rise to uniform concepts which assume an identical form owing to the common negations of not-that effected by them.

The Brahmanical systems criticise the theory of Apoha and argue that a positive meaning for every word must be accepted, otherwise negative meaning cannot be grasped which presupposes the former. Pure negation is never understood from a word. Every idea of negation has always a reference to some positive entity. Absence of direct positive reference is the chief fault in the theory of Apoha. All things negated by cow cannot be distinguished among themselves since they are all negative. Again, since all the individual cows equally are substrates of negations so long as any positive ground for similarity is not grasped, the individuals cannot be recognised as belonging to a class and hence they cannot be regarded as substrates of negation.

Abhāva—According to Buddhists, Abhāva or non-existence is not a distinct reality. It is not cognised independently, because we have a notion of Abhāva in the context of particular time, place and a positive counter entity. It cannot be caused, it cannot be related with anything, it cannot give rise to the cognition. All Brahmanical systems criticise the Buddhist position and establish the reality of Abhāva.

Sāmānya—Buddhists argue that there is no proof for Sāmānya or Universal as a distinct entity. It is not perceived apart from individual and whatever is not perceived is not real. It does not belong to a different place. The Universal is a conceptual construction, a product of relational thought where memory and verbal expression are significantly present. It is the object of determinate cognition which is remote from objective reality, since it mixes the seen and the imagined. Its mode of subsistence or its relation with the individual cannot be logically explained. Distinction of the Universal and individual is verbal.

Brahmanical systems on the other hand establish the reality of the Universal. Universal is independent of being thought of. It is apprehended but not created by the mind. Perception grasps differences and distinctions along with points of similarity and is never about the particular only. Universal is not a conceptual construction since it has an objective basis. It does not arise owing to verbal expression. The objective reality of the Universal is sought to be based on direct perception of the Universal.

Substance—There is no Substance, distinct from and possessing qualities according to the Brahmanical interpretation of Buddhism. What are looked upon as individual substances are only groups of qualities. The so-called gross objects do not exist as such in the external world. They are but our mental constructions. Owing to this mental synthesis, many different qualities appear to have been supported by a single substratum which the orthodox schools call as substance.

All the Brahmanical systems, without exception maintain the reality of substance which distinguishes them from Buddhism. It is argued that every cognition has a corresponding object and bears an explicit reference to the same. Like the cognition of quality like blue colour, hot touch, etc. the cognition of jar as a substance has 'a Jar' for its object. Difference of objective cognitions implies that the objects from which they arise are different. When substance e.g. jar etc. is denied, there is no basis to conceive that the form of a jar belongs to colour and other qualities.

Whole—The Buddhists are represented as the exponents of the pluralistic view. They deny 'Substance' as a principle which synthesises different qualities. They also deny a 'Whole' as a reality apart from the parts. What is perceived in the form of an entity is but an aggregate of atoms. The notion of one with regard to many constituents is a wrong cognition because there is no object corresponding to the cognition, e.g. there is nothing like forest, apart from so many trees. The Whole is never perceived to be distinct from the parts. What we actually see is nothing apart from atoms produced successively in a series.

The Brahmanical systems defend the reality of the Whole. The cognition of Whole does not depend on the cognition of all parts. It can be cognised though the parts are not individually cognised. The invisible atoms cannot form the content of the cognition of the Whole. Cognition of the Whole is distinctly manifest and it is not a wrong cognition because it is not sublated. Denial of the Whole leads to the denial of parts.

In this manner the writers of Brahmanical systems, the Sūtrakāras, the Bhāṣyakāras, the Saṁgrahakāras all state the different views of the Buddhists and criticise them. Here an attempt is made to present in brief both the positions, without taking sides with a view to highlighting these controversies, metaphysical, epistemological and logical, that as a matter of fact ultimately contributed materially to the richness and variety of Indian thought as a whole.

THE SIDDHĀNTAMUKTĀVALI OR THE PEARL NECKLACE OF DOCTRINES

JAMES D. REDINGTON*

THE *Siddhāntamuktāvali* or *the Pearl Necklace of Doctrines* is the third work in the set of *Sixteen-Verse-Treatises* (*Ṣodaśa-granthāḥ*) composed by Vallabhācārya. Viṭṭhalanātha, Vallabha's son and co-founder, wrote a full commentary, *Vivṛti* on it. Puruṣottama, Gokulanātha and Kalyāṇarāya are the most distinguished among the sub-commentators of Viṭṭhala's *Vivṛti*.

The text of the *Siddhāntamuktāvali*, used here, is the one edited by M. T. Telivala and D. V. Sankalia (TS), Nirnayasagar Press, Bombay, 1921 and reprinted by Syam Goswamy, Bombay, in 1980. The other two texts are those of M. G. Shastri (S) in *Kṛṣṇa* : *Ṣodaśagranthāḥ*, Nirnayasagar Press, Bombay, 1930 and Lakshmidas Desai (LD) in *Bṛhatstotrasaritsāgaraḥ*, Bombay, 1927. In all cases where there are variant readings TS text has both the majority reading and the more likely reading, except for one case where both readings are equally likely. In verse 2a, TS and S read *tatsiddhai* while LD reads *satsiddhai* which makes no sense. In verse 12*b* both TS and LD read *brahmarūpe tu*, while S reads *brahmarūpe hi*, which is possible but less likely. In verse 13*a* TS and S read *upādhināśe* while LD reads *upādhināśo*, which again is possible and less likely. In verse 17*a* TS and S read *kliṣṭo' pi* while LD reads *kliṣṭe' pi*. These readings seem to me equally likely so I have chosen to follow the majority readings. Lastly, in verse 19*b* TS and S read *tasmān* while LD reads *tasyām*, which is impossible.

The Sidhāntamuktāvali

natvā harim pravakṣyāmi svasiddhāntaviniścayam |
kṛṣṇasevā sadā kāryā mānasī sā parā matā || 1.

---

*Received Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin, U.S.A. in 1975.

I. Having bowed Hari I will proclaim the settled meaning of His doctrines: worship of Kṛṣṇa must be performed always, and mental worship is the highest type.

After opening the treatise with an obeisance to Hari and a promise to explain the certain meaning (*viniścaya*) of Hari's own scriptural doctrines, Vallabha immediately plunges *in medias res* by introducing the topic of "worship of Kṛṣṇa" (*kṛṣṇasevā*)—the sole pre-occupation of the most advanced devotees in Vallabha's system. And, with no less haste, Vallabha transports us to the highest level of "worship"—"mental worship" (*mānasī sā parā matā*). Viṭṭhala explains the dual connotation of *sevā* as both "worship" and "service" when he says: "For 'worship' is the attribute of a worshipper. By using that word the author has indicated the state of servitude which is natural to all souls" (*sevā hisevaka-dharmaḥ; taduktyā jīvānāmaśeṣānāṁ sahajadāsatvaṁ jñāpitam*). "This (worship) has two forms—the one which embodies the reward and the one which embodies the means to the reward. The meaning of the words 'mental worship is the highest type' is that mental worship embodies the reward" (*sā ca phalarūpā sādhanarūpā cāste; tatra 'mānasī sā parā' phalarūpetyarthaḥ*). "As, for example, with the women of Vraja. It is that (mental worship) alone which the Lord of their life described when He said: 'These women, their minds captivated by their total attachment to Me, knew neither their own selves nor the other world, nor even this world'" (*yathā vrajasīmantinīnām; iyadeva tatprāṇanāthena gītaṁ 'tā nāvidanmayyanuṣaṅgabaddhadhiyaḥ svamātmānamadastathedam' iti. Bhāgavata Purāṇa XI 12.12.*)

cetastatpravaṇaṁ sevā tatsiddhyai tanuvittajā |
tataḥ saṁsāraduḥkhasya nivṛttirbrahmabodhanam || 2.

II. This mental worship occurs when the mind is completely intent on Him. To accomplish that, the devotee performs worship with both his body and his possessions. The end of Saṁsāra's suffering, as well as awakening t Brahman, come as by-products of this worship.

It is a complex rather than a simple definition of terms that Vallabha gives us in verse two. The definition provides us with a composite picture of worship, mental worship, the process from one to the other, and some of the effects of that process. Vallabha is an extremely concise writer. But nowhere is he so concise about so important a topic as here. He begins by defining the goal to be reached— "mental worship."[1] Vallabha says that this highest form of worship occurs "when the mind is completely intent on Him (Kṛṣṇa)" (*cetas-tatpravaṇaṁ sevā*). This is clear enough, and Viṭṭhala has already given us a good scriptural example of this state of mind. The sense intended by Vallabha is one of estatic, exclusive pre-occupation with Kṛṣṇa. The devotee has absolutely no other concern or thought. After defining the goal, then, Vallabha concisely specifies the means of attaining it. "To accomplish that (mental worship)," he says, "the devotee performs worship with both his body and his possessions" (*tatsiddhyai tanuvittajā* (*sevā*)). But what precisely does "worship with both his body and his possessions" mean? Viṭṭhala says: "One kind is that in which the devotee donates his possessions for worship, and has another person perform the worship. And the other kind is the worship performed by the second person. But Vallabhācārya makes the two words (*tanu*—body, and *vitta*—possessions) into a single compound word precisely to indicate his teaching that these two kinds of worship separately do not accomplish that (mental worship). What he means when he says this is that, after the devotee has offered all his possessions unconditionally for the Blessed Lord's sake, he employs his own body in worship, love of God arises, and that (mental worship) results."[2]

---

[1] Puruṣottama assures us that it is mental worship, and not worship in general, as some interpreters contend, that Vallabha is defining here when he says, in his sub-commentary: "Here in Vallabāchārya's text it is the essence of mental worship that is spoken of in the phrase: 'worship occurs when the mind is completely intent on Him" (*atra mūle mānasyāḥ svarūpaṁ 'cetastatpravaṇaṁ sevā' ityanenoktam*).

[2] Skt.: *vittaṁ daivā anyena puruṣeṇa kṛtvā kāritaikā; etādṛśena puṁsā kṛtā cāparā. etādṛśau te tatsādhike netyabhiprāya-jñāpakaṁ samastam padam; tatraiva svadeha-ctena bhagavadarthaṁ nirūpadhisvasarvasva-nivedanapūrvakaṁ tatraiva svadeha-viniyoge premṇi jāte sā bhavatīti bhāvaḥ.*

The complete fixation of the mind on the Lord which is mental worship is, of course, an absolute value in itself ; it is the reward of worship. But Vallabha mentions two other rewards—" secondary " or " extra " rewards (*avāntaraphala*), as Viṭṭhala calls them—which result directly from the process of worshipping Kṛṣṇa with one's body and possessions. Since these rewards come whether the devotee desires them or not, we can call them " by-products." They are " the end of Saṁsāra's suffering (*saṁsāraduḥkhasya nivṛttir*) and " awakening to Brahman " (*brahmabodhanam*) ; the first, being " a removal of what is undesired " (*aniṣṭanivṛtti*), and the second " an attainment of what is desired " (*iṣṭaprāpti*). " Saṁsāra has as its essence the sense of ' I ' and ' mine ' ; it does not have the universe as its essence, because Brahman is the essence of the universe " (*ahaṁtāmamatātmakaḥ saṁsāro, na tu prapañcātmakaḥ, tasya brahmātmakatvāt*). This is a statement of Vallabha's important doctrine that the universe is real, while it is Saṁsāra that has no final reality—a doctrine which distinguishes Vallabha's position clearly from that of Śaṅkara, for whom both these are ultimately unreal. Next, Viṭṭhala defines the second reward, " awakening to Brahman," as " realization of the fact that Akṣara Brahman is the essence both of one's own Self and of the universe " (*svātmani prapañce cākṣarabrahmātmakatvena jñānam*).

Having now mentioned two all-important names : " Kṛṣṇa " and " Brahman," Vallabha must clarify the relationship between the two since both names refer to the Godhead. If Kṛṣṇa is the object of the devotee's worship—bodily, material and mental—and Brahman is realized merely as a side effect of worship, then where does Brahman stand in relation to Kṛṣṇa ? The necessity of answering this question makes Vallabha's third verse a statement of the most central doctrine of his system : the nature of God.

param brahma tu kṛṣṇo hi saccidānandakam bṛhat |
dvirūpaṁ taddhi sarvaṁ syādekaṁ tasmād vilakṣaṇam ||3

III. For Kṛṣṇa alone is the Highest Brahman. And the Great Brahman has Being, Consciousness and limited Joy as its essence. For the Great Brahman has two aspects : it may be conceived of as everything—the universe—or as one, separate from everything.

Vallabha's answer to the above question comes in the form of a statement distinguishing the Godhead into two different aspects: Kṛṣṇa, who is " the Highest Brahman " (*param brahma*), and " the Great Brahman " (*bṛhat*), which " has Being, Consciousness and limited Joy as its essence " (*saccidānandakam*). This is Vallabha's famous distinction between Kṛṣṇa (or Puruṣottama, or Parabrahman, or Paramātman, or Bhagavān) and Akṣara Brahman, which Vallabha here calls " the Great " (*bṛhat*).[3] Viṭṭhala explains how the Sanskrit word which Vallabha uses, *saccidānandaka-*, points up this difference : " (Vallabhācārya) indicates, by using the suffix *-ka*, that Akṣara Brahman possesses limited Joy only, unlike Puruṣottama, who possesses Joy in its fulness " (*kapratyayena gaṇitānandatvameva, na tu puruṣottamavat pūrṇānandatvamiti jñāpyate*).

Under the first aspect, says Vallabha, Akṣara Brahman "may be conceived of as everything—the universe " (*tad . . . sarvaṁ syād*). Viṭṭhala explains : " The meaning is that one aspect has become manifest in the form of the universe (*prapañcarūpenāvirbhūtamekamityarthaḥ*). Under the second aspect, continues Vallabha, Akṣara Brahman may be thought of " as one, separate from everything " (*ekaṁ tasmād vilakṣaṇam*). Viṭṭhala describes this aspect fully : " this aspect (of Akṣara) as one is separate from its aspect as the universe in that this second aspect is single in form, is taught as separate by holy scripture, is the object of meditation of the sages and is the *locus* of their ultimate liberation, is the dwelling-place of Puruṣottama, etc..''[4] That Akṣara Brahman is " the locus of ultimate liberation " for the sages means that it is " the ground " of their liberation, the reality into which they strive to be liberated. And " the dwelling-place (*adhiṣṭhāna*) of Puruṣottama " refers to Vallabha's teaching that, since Akṣara Brahman is the subject of the scriptural sayings which teach omnipresence. It is the ground for Puruṣottama's omnipresence. In other words, Akṣara Brahman is the location and the surroundings in which Puruṣottama appears. It is, if you will, Puruṣottama's " immediate environment," whether Puruṣottama is appearing in His Vaikuṇṭha-heaven, or in the heart of a devotee (or a sage, as in verse fourteen below), or in the image which a devotee worships as Kṛṣṇa (*sevya svarūpa*).

---

[3] Viṭṭhala leaves us in no doubt that Vallabha's word *bṛhat* refers to Akṣara Brahman, since he uses the words *akṣaram brahma* in reference to this being no less than three times in his commentary on this verse.

[4] Skt.: *ekaṁ rūpaṁ tasmāt prapañcarūpāt ekarūpatvena śrutipratipādyatvena jñānyupāsyatvena tanmuktisthānatvena puruṣottamādhiṣṭhānatvādibhirvilakṣaṇam-ityarthaḥ.*

> *aparaṁ tatra pūrvasmin vādino bahudhā jaguḥ |*
> *māyikaṁ saguṇaṁ kāryaṁ svatantraṁ ceti naikadhā ||* 4

> *IV.* Regarding the first aspect, the universe, philosophers have expressed many different teachings which are contrary to the *Vedas*. They have described the universe as a product of illusion; as a result merely of the combination of the three constituents; as an effect; as an independent reality, and in many other ways.

The word *tatra* is said to refer to Akṣara Brahman. And *pūrvasmin* is explained as a reference to the first-mentioned aspect of Akṣara: the universe. Hence my translation: "Regarding the first aspect—the universe." Vallabha's very first word, *aparam*, on the other hand, is trickier. For this word, which means, literally and simply, "other," Viṭṭhala provides us with the most logical interpretation by explaining that *aparam* means: "a teaching different from, or 'other than' the teaching of the *Vedas*" (*vedamatādaparam bhinnam matam*). As often happens, 'other than' is taken to mean 'contrary to.' Now Vallabha goes on to list, briefly but precisely, the different incorrect teachings on the nature of the universe. He mentions first the school he considered his prime opponent, Advaita Vedānta. Its teaching that the universe is a product of cosmic illusion (*māyā*) is, according to Vallabha, contrary to the *Vedas*, which are, of course, the unimpeachable source of truth for all Vedāntins. Next Vallabha condemns the view of the influential Sāṁkhya school—that the universe is a result, or effect of the combination of the three "constituents" (*guṇa*), namely *sattva*, *rajas*, and *tamas*. It must be added that the Sāṁkhya view is condemned only insofar as it claims that the universe is a product "merely" of the interaction of the constituents. For in verse ten of this same work, Vallabha will endorse the view that the universe is indeed made up of the three constituents, but the three constituents understood as a lower aspect of Brahman, and firmly under the control of Brahman. Vallabha has no time for the view that the three constituents are an independent force. Vallabha then proceeds to reject the doctrine of the Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika schools that the universe is an "effect," as Viṭṭhala explains, "brought about by the Lord through the successive combination of pairs, triads, etc., of atoms" ('*kāryaṁ*' *dvyaṇukādikrameṇeśvara-kāryam iti naiyāyikāḥ*). And the last view which Vallabha rejects explicitly is that of the Mīmāṁsā school, which contends that the universe is "independent" (*sva-tantra*), *i.e.*, a self-sustaining, closed system. Viṭṭhala, by way of explaining Vallabha's word "independent," quotes a Mīmāṁsaka saying which describes the nature of the universe by using a memorable double negative: "the world is never not-of-this-type" (*na kadācid anīdṛśaṁ jagat*). This saying affirms the independence of the universe because it negates any process of the universe from cause (or causes) to effect, which all the other systems affirm. Vallabha rejects this view, too, as not based on the *Vedas*.

tadevaitatprakāreṇa bhavatīti śrutermatam |
dvirūpaṁ cāpi gaṅgāvajjñeyaṁ sā jalarūpiṇī || 5

māhātmyasaṁyutā nṛṇāṁ sevatām bhuktimuktidā |
maryādāmārgavidhinā tathā brahmāpi budhyatām || 6

V-VI. But the *Vedas* teach that Brahman alone takes the form of this universe. And we should understand the two aspects of Brahman in the same way we understand the double aspect of the Ganges. For in one aspect the Ganges is simply water, but in the other it is endowed with a special sacredness and grants enjoyment and freedom to those who worship it according to the law of the Path of Limitations. We should understand Brahman, too, in the same way.

Vallabha's assertion concerning the nature of the universe—"Brahman alone takes the form of this universe" (*tadevaitatprakāreṇa bhavati*)—translates literally as follows: "That (Brahman) alone becomes according to the mode of this (universe)." Many Vedic sayings back up this teaching, and Viṭṭhala cites a few of them, such as: "Indeed all this is Brahman" (*sarvaṁ khalvidam* *brahma*), and " He (Brahman) was of this extent " (*sa haitāvānāsa*). In philosophic terms, Vallabha is saying the *Vedas* teach that Brahman is simultaneously the efficient and material cause of the universe (*nimittopādānakāraṇa*). In this teaching Vallabha agrees with Rāmānuja and a number of other Vedāntins (Śaṅkara and his followers not being among them, as usual). Now Vallabha returns to his assertion that Akṣara Brahman has two aspects as universe, and as Itself, separate from all else—and he now compares these two aspects with the dual aspect of the Ganges. Just as, in its most obvious aspect, the Ganges is simply water, so Brahman in the same aspect, is simply the universe. But just as the Ganges is known to be especially sacred (*māhātmyasaṁyutā*) and to grant rewards to its worshippers, so Brahman-in-Itself, the second aspect, is transcendently sacred, and is the source of ultimate freedom for those who realize it by following the laws of the Path of Limitations (*maryādāmārgavidhi*). To clarify this last notion briefly, Vallabha's major distinction concerning souls who are eligible for ultimate freedom (*daiva-jīva*) is that, for some of these, Kṛṣṇa's Grace (*puṣṭi, anugraha*) is the only factor determining their attainment of salvation (this doctrine is stated in verse eighteen of the present treatise). These persons, then, are on the Path of Grace (*puṣṭimārga*). But there are other souls, also destined for liberation, who are meant to attain their salvation by following strictly all the laws, limitations, injunctions, etc. (*maryādā*), which are revealed in the Scriptures. These persons are on what Vallabha calls the Path of Limitations (*maryādāmārga*). It is important to note here, and to remember, that Vallabha is using the term " Path of Limitations" here to refer to only two of the three usual paths included in that term: the Path or Works (*karmamārga*) and, especially, the Path of Knowledge (*jñānamārga*). The Path of Devotion according to Scriptural Limitations (*maryādā- bhaktimārga*) is not included in the meaning of the term *maryādāmārga* here. This is because Vallabha is about to devote the rest of the treatise to teaching us the superiority of the Path of Devotion to the Path of Knowledge, as he will tell us in verse nineteen. And so Vallabha, in the present context, is setting up an equation between Akṣara Brahman's second aspect, Brahman-in-Itself, and the rewards proper to the Paths of Works and Knowledge, especially the latter. In the next few verses and subsequently, he will set up the corresponding equation between Kṛṣṇa and the reward proper to the Path of Devotion. Consequently, Vallabha's distinction here is not between *puṣṭi* (Grace) and *maryādā* (Limitations), but between the Path of Devotion (*bhakti*—which includes all *puṣṭi*-souls and some *maryādā*-souls) and the Path of Knowledge (*jñāna*—which includes only *maryādā*-souls). If we do not keep this distinction in mind, we will be confused by Vallabha's overlapping terminology. Likewise we should continue to keep in mind the equations between Akṣara Brahman and the Path of Knowledge, on the one hand and Kṛṣṇa and the Path of Devotion on the other.

Vallabha has given us, then, a concrete example of the two aspects of Akṣara Brahman. But now he adds the third aspect of the Godhead—Kṛṣṇa—and continues to use the Ganges as his illustrative example. Vallabha is here adding the level of the personal God and of Devotion (*bhakti*). For him this is the supreme level. In this group of verses, then, Vallabha is giving us his teachings on the nature of the Supreme Brahman, Kṛṣṇa. Viṭṭhala has treated these next five-and-one-half verses as a unit, and I will follow him in this.

tatraiva devatāmūrtirbhaktyā yā dṛśyate kvacit /
gaṅgāyāṁ ca viśeṣeṇa pravāhābhedabuddhaye //7

pratyakṣā sā na sarveṣāṁ prākāmyaṁ syāt tayā jale /
vihitācca phalāttaddhi pratītyāpi viśiṣyate //8

yathā jalaṁ tathā sarvaṁ yathā śaktā tathā bṛhat /
yathā devī tathā kṛṣṇastatrāpyetadihocyate //9

jagattu trividham proktam brahmaviṣṇuśivāstataḥ /
devatārūpavatproktāḥ brahmaṇītthaṁ harirmataḥ //10

kāmacārastu loke'smin brahmādibhyo na cā'nyathā /
paramānandarūpe tu kṛṣṇe svātmani niścayaḥ //11

vastu brahmavādena kṛṣṇe buddhirvidhīyatām //12a

VII-VIII. Through devotion, one occasionally catches sight of the Goddess, who abides in the very water of the river. She is visible, especially in the Ganges, to the devotee who realizes her identity with the waters. She is not visible to all, yet it is through her that Ganges-water has the power of fulfilling all one's excellent desires. For the sight of Her, even with merely the mind's eye, surpasses the rewards specified by the scriptures.

IX. As is that water, so is the universe ; as is the Ganges' sacred power, so is the Great Brahman ; as is the Goddess, so is Kṛṣṇa. Yet what follows must also be added.

X-XIIa. The scripture teach that this universe, too, is threefold (*i.e.*, composed of the three constituents). Therefore Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva have been proclaimed presiding deities of the constituents. But all these exist in Brahman, and Hari, as Controller of Brahman Itself, is proclaimed as the Controller of all. All wilful activity with regard to the devotee himself, both in this world and in the next, is not from Brahmā and the others, but exists only in Kṛṣṇa, in His manifestation as Supreme Joy. This the devotee perceives with certainty. And so he should fix his mind on Kṛṣṇa in accordance with our Doctrine of Brahman.

Viṭṭhala points out that the first level of the analogy—the Ganges simply as water is equivalent to the material universe—is the *ādhibhautika*, or " elemental," level. And the *ādhyātmika* or " spiritual " level is represented by the equivalence of the " special sacredness " of the Ganges with Brahman-in-Itself, the source of liberation for those who are on the Path of Knowledge. Now Vallabha adds the *ādhidaivika* or " divine " level—the equivalence between the Goddess Gaṅgā and Kṛṣṇa who is the Inner Controller of both the universe and Brahman.

Only through devotion can one see the supreme reality of the Ganges—the Goddess; and of Kṛṣṇa. In both cases it is essential that the supreme reality be seen in terms of the realization that Gaṅgā is inseparable from the waters of the river, or, in Kṛṣṇa's case, the Flow of existence (*pravāhābhedabuddhi*). For there is no doubt that Vallabha is using the word *pravāha*—a key word for him —in a double sense here, to apply to both Gaṅgā and Kṛṣṇa. *Pravāha* means " flow or stream of water." And it is the name Vallabha gives to the path of all those souls who are not eligible to attain liberation, and consequently remain in the cycles of existence in the world (*saṁsāra*). His term *pravāha-mārga* may be translated as " the Path or Flow."[5] Therefore, Vallabha's use of *pravāha* here refers, in its most frequent sense, to Gaṅgā—She is seen as identical with the stream, with the waters; and in Vallabha's more specialized sense, *pravāha* refers to the vision of Kṛṣṇa as non-separate (*abheda*) from the flow of existence—the people and things of the world. Viṭṭhala agrees with this interpretation and adds that, whether one sees, in the midst of the world, a form of the Lord or a true devotee of the Lord, it amounts to a true manifestation and vision of the Lord (*etena prapañcamadhya eva bhagavadākārabhagavadbhaktayordarśane. . . tatra bhagavatprākaṭyam bhavatīti bhāvaḥ sūcyate*). Thus the devotee is a special place of manifestation, but the Lord can of course, manifest Himself in any one or anything.

Vallabha extends the analogy in verse eight, by affirming that it is the divinity presiding within an object which gives that object any power it may have, even though that divinity is invisible to all but those who, as Viṭṭhala says, are experiencing an " abundance of devotion " (*bhaktyudrekadaśāyāmeva*). Therefore, it is Gaṅgā alone who communicates to Ganges-water its famous " power of fulfilling all one's excellent desires ". Similarly, it is Kṛṣṇa that is the controlling deity of all and everything, any power of special brilliance of a particular thing comes directly from Him, and provides an opportunity for seeing Him to those whose devotion is strong. The meaning is that thus alone—in the vision of the Lord of the type described—does His existence in everything burst into view (*evamevoktaprakārakabhagavaddarśane sarvatra tadbhāvaḥ sphuratīti bhāvaḥ*).

---

[5] My original inclination was to translate *pravāhamārga* with a more philosophical turn, as " the Path of Flux." But what may be fortunate philosophically is less felicitous physiologically (!). Professor Mainkar's excellent suggestion was " the Path of Drift." In many contexts, I think that is the best translation. But in the present context and in general, it seems to me " the Path of Flow " might work best.

The vision of Ganges surpasses all the rewards promised to those who worship Her "special sacredness" (*māhātmya*, verse six) according to the scriptural instructions. Likewise the vision of Kṛṣṇa through devotion is superior to the rewards of the Paths of Works or Knowledge, *i.e.*, the Svarga-heaven or liberation in Brahman. And not only is the actual vision of Gaṅgā and Kṛṣṇa superior to those rewards, but such a vision seen "even with merely the mind's eye" (*pratītyāpi*, as opposed to *pratyakṣā*, "visible," in the same verse) also surpasses the scriptural rewards.

Viṭṭhala gives the second interpretation, as follows: "The meaning is that, by reason of the experience of that reward which is specified in the *Purāṇas* and elsewhere, for seeing, touching, etc, Her water, as well as by the perception of the minds of the great devotees, Her water is superior to other waters. And in the same way, those devotees in whose heart the Blessed Lord is present are superior to other devotees."[6] Here the emphasis is on the "rewards specified in scripture," not as something of lesser value, but precisely as proofs of the Ganges' superiority to all other waters. And, analogically, devotees of Kṛṣṇa are superior to all other devotees.

"This universe, too, is threefold" (*jagattu trividham*), says Vallabha, introducing another trio on the first of our three levels of reality. This turns out not to be so confusing, however, since the other two levels are single and simple, and it is well known in Indian thought that the world is threefold, composed of the three constituents" (*trividhaṁ triguṇātmakam*). Vallabha accepts this Sāṁkhya theory of the universe once it is admitted that Brahman, and not merely "material nature" (*prakṛti*), is the source and stuff of the universe. The three deities, Trimurti preside over the functioning of the material universe (*jagat*)—no more, no less. Brahmā, as Creator, is associated with *rajas* or activity; Viṣṇu, as Preserver, presides over *sattva*, goodness; while Śiva the Destroyer is, in this role, linked with *tamas* or darkness.

---

[6] Skt.: *purāṇādiṣu tajjaladarśanādibhiḥ phalaṁ yaduktaṁ tadanubhavena mahatāmantaḥkaraṇapratītyāpi tajjalamanyebhyo jalebhyo viśiṣyata ityarthaḥ. evaṁ yeṣāṁ hṛdi bhagavatsānnidhyaṁ te bhaktā anyebhyo viśiṣyate.*

Vallabha has now made his additional clarification about the universe. What remains is for him to fit this into the scheme of reality he has already established. He must show how the Trimūrti relates to the second level of reality, Brahman, and how both relate to Kṛṣṇa. This Vallabha accomplishes, with even more than the usual conciseness, in four short words: *brahmaṇi ittham harir mataḥ.* The gods of the Triad are merely lower forms of Brahman, which is the second level of reality. "Thus Hari is taught to be in Brahman." But Hari is not "in Brahman" in the same sense as the Triad is "in Brahman"—as a subordinate member. Rather, Hari is in Brahman as "Controller" (*niyāmaka*, as Viṭṭhala says) and superior entity. Kalyāṇarāya assures us that both Vallabha and Viṭṭhala intend to teach that Hari is the Controller of Akṣara Brahman by quoting and paraphrasing each of Vallabha's four words here. Puruṣottama gives the same interpretation. The result in translation is: "But all these exist in Brahman, and Hari, as Controller of Brahman Itself, is proclaimed as the Controller of all." Viṭṭhala, in interpreting this passage, chooses to focus on two aspects which are worth mentioning: that "it is the Blessed Lord alone who has made Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva controlling deities of the constituents" (*tena tattadguṇaniyāmakatvena brahmādayo bhagavataiva kṛtā ityarthaḥ*); and that "Hari alone is the Controller of the three gods of the Triad, who are based on It (Brahman)" *tanniṣṭhānāṁ niyāmako harireva*). This last phrase gives us the clue that Vallabha's word *brahmaṇi* is meant to refer backward, to those deities who are "based on Brahman," as well as forward, to Hari "the Controller of Brahman Itself." And Viṭṭhala's first phrase teaches that Hari controls the very controllers of the constituents, and thus "is the Controller of all." And so Vallabha in this verse has demonstrated the three levels of reality in a new way: from the viewpoint of the control of all reality. And once again, it is the third, the divine, level, which is the really Real, the Cause, and the Controller.

Now Vallabha gives his final verse on the nature of Kṛṣṇa as the Highest Reality (*parabrahman*). This verse is a statement of Vallabha's doctrine that Kṛṣṇa is the supreme and only agent, the initiator of all acts on every level of reality. In the words of the famous Vaiṣṇava saying: *kartā kārayitā hariḥ* (Hari is the Agent—the One who causes all acts). Vallabha frames this doctrine here in terms of a specific sentence about "wilful activity" (*kāmacāra*), *i.e.*, freely willed action done by a free agent. And here the wilful activity is that which takes place "with regard to the devotee himself" (*svātmani*). In other words, Vallabha's statement concerns a human person's apparently freely-willed action. He says that this wilful activity, "both in this world and in the next" (*loke'smin . . . cā'nyathā*), "is not from Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva" (*brahmādibhyo na*), "but exists only in Kṛṣṇa, in His manifestation as Supreme Joy" (*paramānandarūpe tu kṛṣṇe*). Vallabha's presupposition here is that a human person (*jīva*) is not a free agent, and consequently, any free action in his regard must come from one or other of the "controllers" of the universe, who are the subjects of the last verse. This is a statement of Vallabha's thorough-going determinism—a cardinal teaching of his philosophy. The relevant question for Vallabha, then, is whether this freely willed activity comes from one of the controllers of the material universe—Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and Śiva—or from someone else. Vallabha's unhesitating answer is that such action, both in this world and in the next, does not come from any god of the Trimūrti, but from the Controller of all-Kṛṣṇa Himself in His "Supreme Joy" aspect, *i.e.*, in His very highest form. Hari is indeed "the Agent who causes all acts." Every activity with regard to one of His devotees is initiated and controlled by Kṛṣṇa. This is precisely the interpretation Viṭṭhala gives to this sentence of Vallabha's. He says: "The meaning here is that for those who are the Blessed Lord's devotees, wilful activity concerning every object, this-worldly and other-worldly, which has reference to themselves, exists in Śrī Kṛṣṇa alone" (*ye tu bhagavadbhaktāsteṣāṁ svātmani svātma-viṣaye aihike pāralaukike cārthe śrīkṛṣṇa eva kāmacāra ityarthaḥ*). The only thing that is a bit unexpected about this statement of Vallabha's is that the controller of the devotees' actions is said to be Kṛṣṇa "in His manifestation as Supreme Joy." Vallabha's normal teaching, according to Shri Shyam Goswamy, is that the individual person's actions are initiated and controlled by Kṛṣṇa in His aspect as "individual Inner Controller" (*vyaṣṭi-antaryāmin*). What Vallabha seems to be saying here, then, is that, in the case of the true devotees, Kṛṣṇa comes and dwells in their hearts in His highest form, and thus He, in His Supreme Joy form, becomes their Inner Controller.

ātmani brahmarūpe tu chidrā vyomnīva cetanāḥ //12*b*

Upādhināśe vijñāne brahmātmatvāvabodhane /
gaṅgātīrasthito yadvaddevatāṁ tatra paśyati //13

tathā Kṛṣṇam param brahma svasmin jñānī prapaśyati /
saṁsarī yastu bhajate sa dūrastho yathā tathā //14

apekṣitajalādīnāmabhāvāttatra duḥkhabhāk /
tasmācchrīkṛṣṇamārgastho vimuktaḥ sarvalokataḥ //15

ātmānandasamudrasthaṁ kṛṣṇameva vicintayet /16*a*

XII*b*-XV*a*. The Self is an aspect of Brahman, but our souls are like little enclosed spaces, as opposed to the limitless sky that is the Self. Once the limiting factor or ignorance is destroyed, knowledge dawns, and we awake to the fact that our Self is identical with Brahman. Like the person who stands on the bank of the Ganges and sees the Goddess in it, so the sage sees Kṛṣṇa, the Highest Brahman, in himself. But the person who worships Kṛṣṇa while he is still involved in Saṁsāra is like some one worshipping the Ganges from afar. Since the Ganges-water and the other things he needs are absent, he remains a sufferer.

XVb-XVIa. Therefore the person who is on the Path of Lord Kṛṣṇa, totally free from every bondage of the world, should contemplate Kṛṣṇa as abiding within him in the ocean of His own Joy.

Vallabha now undertakes to establish the place of the soul (*jīva*) in the scheme of reality he has explained in the preceding verses (the word he uses for " soul " is actually *cetana*, a synonym for *jīva*). Vallabha immediately places the *jīva* in the context of the Upanishadic doctrine that Ātman, " the Self," is identical with Brahman. Therefore, it is the second level of reality, that of Akṣara Brahman in itself, that is being spoken of here, rather than first level—Akṣara Brahman as the universe.

After introducing his first subject by saying : " the Self is an aspect of Brahman " (*ātmani brahmarūpe*), he relates the *jīva* to the *ātman* when he says : " but our souls are like little enclosed spaces as opposed to the limitless sky that is the Self" (*tu chidrā vyomnīva cetanāḥ*). The Ātman, then, is the vast, limitless space, while the *jīva* is, for some reason, limited, plural in number, and much smaller, but nonetheless space, *i.e.*, identical in nature. Viṭṭhala confirms that it is these aspects of the *jīva* Vallabha is stressing when he says: "For the souls are atomic, and they have Akṣara as their essence" (*jīvā hyaṇavo' kṣarātmakāḥ*). The doctrine that souls are atomic (*aṇu*), rather than pervasive (*vibhu*, *vyāpaka*), is the essential statement concerning the nature of the soul, for both Vallabha and Vaiṣṇava *bhakti* in general. For only if the soul is atomic can it realize that it is but a small part, completely dependent on the pervasive Lord, whereas if it were pervasive it would be to that extent equal with the Lord, and would in all likelihood consider itself Lord. Likewise there is a plurality of souls, for a Lord needs subjects whom he can be Lord in relation to. The soul is tiny, then, but it is essentially identical with the Self. And both the Self and the soul are identical with Akṣara, but there is a limitation preventing the soul/Self from realizing its identity with Brahman. Vallabha refers to this limitation in the next half-verse, calling it *upādhi*, which I have translated by "limiting factor." This factor is, of course, ignorance (*avidyā*), which intervenes and prevents the *jīva* from knowing its real nature, as Viṭṭhala tells us. Vallabha and Viṭṭhala accept the general Vedānta teaching on ignorance.

The realization of the identity of Ātman and Brahman is not the final reward or the ultimate realization of truth. Rather, it is the ideal last step before the vision, experienced by "the sage" (*jñānī*—the one who has realized the Ātman/Brahman identity), of "Kṛṣṇa, the Highest Brahman, in himself" (*kṛṣṇam paraṃ brahma svasmin jñānī prapaśyati*). This is the culmination of the soul's progress from the level of ignorance through the second level—that of Akṣara Brahman—to the third and supreme level of reality.

In order to state this doctrine precisely, Vallabha calls once again upon the analogy of the Ganges. We already know that the accomplished devotee who stands on the banks of the Ganges occasionally sees Gaṅgā in the waters. Just so, says Vallabha "the (realized) sage" sees further the very Highest Brahman, Kṛṣṇa, in himself. Viṭṭhala clarifies well for us this process from ignorance through self-realization as Brahman to the vision of Kṛṣṇa as one's Self. He says : "when the obstacles to awakening to the fact that Ātman is Brahman—that obstacle which consists of ignorance—is destroyed, and when the knowledge that is characterized by awakening to the fact that Ātman is Brahman takes place, *i.e.*, when that experience is produced, the soul becomes fit for the manifestation of Puruṣottama. When this situation has come about, the person sees Him (Puruṣottama) very clearly in his own Self. This is what the passage means."[7]. It is then, by passing from the lower to the higher level that the soul becomes fit for experience of the very highest.

Only one word remains to be clarified in Vallabha's text, and that is *svasmin*—"in himself." When the sage sees Kṛṣṇa "in himself," does this refer to a kind of indwelling of Kṛṣṇa in the person, or does it refer to a vision, experienced by the person, of identity between Kṛṣṇa and his own Self (*ātman*) ? I think there are a number of reasons for saying that Vallabha intends the latter—the vision of Kṛṣṇa as one's own Self. First of all, the analogy of the Ganges is used, in which the devotee sees Gaṅgā in the river. We must remember that, as spelled out in the earlier verses, the devotee who sees this vision is the one who realizes the identity of Gaṅgā with her waters. And, by Vallabha's analogy, the devotee who sees Kṛṣṇa is the one who realizes His identity with the things of the worldly flow (*pravāha*). So here, the "sage" who "sees Kṛṣṇa . . . in himself" must be the one who realizes the identity between Kṛṣṇa and himself. Secondly, Viṭṭhala gives us two hints that it is the identity of Kṛṣṇa and the Self which is meant here. We remember that Viṭṭhala, in giving his alternative interpretation of Vallabha's words *kṛṣṇe svātmani*, in verse eleven, noted that devotees, in an ecstasy of love, experience the Lord as their very Self (it is also "in an abundance of devotion," according to Viṭṭhala, that a devotee sees Gaṅgā in the Ganges and Kṛṣṇa in the universe). And besides this, in his comment on the present passage, which I have quoted at length above, Viṭṭhala uses the word *svātmani* ("in his own Self") instead of repeating Vallabha's word *svasmin* though he repeats Vallabha's words in most other cases. It is very probable that he does this precisely to clarify the point we are discussing. For all these reasons, then, I think we can say that Vallabha is teaching here the experience of the identity of Kṛṣṇa Parabrahman and the Self (*ātman*) of the "sage." So it is not only Brahman that is experienced as Ātman. Kṛṣṇa, too, is experienced as one's very Self. This is the ultimate reality. The *jīva* is Kṛṣṇa. A part, no doubt, but nevertheless Kṛṣṇa Himself. And even though in Vallabha's system the soul on the Path of Grace (*puṣṭi jīva*) experiences this only in passing moments, while at all other times he subordinates himself to play a part in Kṛṣṇa's Eternal Game (*nityalīlā*), the fact that the soul/Self (*jīvātman*) is Kṛṣṇa remains always true. And in fact, the person who practices devotion according to scriptural limitations (*maryādābhakti jīva*), who is the most proper subject of this teaching of Vallabha's, can actually stop at this stage, attaining his reward (*phalam*) in the form of *sāyujya*—" intimate union." This " intimate union " is actually a merging into Kṛṣṇa. And so, the process here described by Vallabha is the highest truth *and* the final reward proper to the soul who practices devotion according to the Path of Limitations (*maryādābhakti*).

---

[7] Skt.: *brahmātmakatvāvabodhanapratibandhakasyāvidyātmakasya nāśe brahmātmakatvāvabodhanalakṣaṇe vijñāne' nubhave sampanne puruṣottamāvirbhāvayogyatā tasmin jāte svātmani taṃ prakarṣeṇa paśyatītyarthaḥ.*

In the first verse the subject is *jñānī*, " the sage," who, says Vallabha, is like the devotee who comes right to the Ganges and stays on her banks until he attains the desired vision of the Goddess. But in the second verse the subject is *saṁsārī*, " the person who worships Kṛṣṇa while he is still involved in Saṁsāra," the opposite of the *jñānī*. The *saṁsārī* may indeed be attempting to worship Kṛṣṇa, but unlike the *jñānī*, he simply is not taking the means. His worship is almost a contradiction in terms, because he wants the reward without having to do what is necessary to gain it. He is like someone who worships the Ganges " from afar " (*dūrastho*). He simply does not have, and cannot get, the Ganges-water and the other things he really needs (*apekṣitajalādīnām*) to perform the worship fully and effectively. And so, " he remains a sufferer " (*duḥkhabhāk*). In the same way, the *saṁsārī* who is still " attached to this world " (*prapañcāsaktaḥ*), as Viṭṭhala says, will remain a sufferer if he worships Kṛṣṇa merely by performing acts of worship, without breaking the bonds of Saṁsāra.

The subject of the final verse is " the person who is on the Path of Lord Kṛṣṇa " (*śrīkṛṣṇamārgastho*). Viṭṭhala tells us, that this means " a devotee who is on the Path of Grace." Vallabha next tells us that this devotee is " totally free from every bondage of the world " (*vimuktaḥ sarvalokataḥ*). The Sanskrit words, *ātmānandasamudrasthaṁ kṛṣṇameva vicintayet*, mean literally that the devotee " should contemplate Kṛṣṇa alone as standing in the ocean of Joy of the Self." The first thing we should note here is that the form of Kṛṣṇa referred to seems to be the " Supreme Joy form " (*paramānandarūpa*) already referred to, in association with the devotee, in verse eleven. Secondly, and more immediately, there is a difficulty in interpreting the word " Self " (*ātma-*) in this passage. Does " Self refer to Kṛṣṇa's Self or the devotee's Self? One might logically argue that, since Kṛṣṇa's Self is already known to be an " Ocean of Joy "—pure and permanent Joy (*sadānanda*)—it would be redundant to refer to Kṛṣṇa by both " ocean of Joy " and " Self " in the same statement. On the other hand, the placement of the word *ātma-* seems to imply that it is used here as reflexive pronoun—" his own," *i.e.*, " Kṛṣṇa's own Joy " (*ātmānanda-*). Besides, in Vallabha's system Joy (*ānanda*) is precisely what the devotee lacks, and so he seeks from Kṛṣṇa, who alone is pure Joy, the reawakening of his own natural Joy (*ānandāṁśa*). Viṭṭhala solves this quandary for us by showing how the word *ātma-*, in a unique but very explainable way, is meant to cast its shadow of reference over both the devotee and Kṛṣṇa. He says : " The words ' Lord Kṛṣṇa ' (in " Path of Lord Kṛṣṇa " above) are meant to tell us that Kṛṣṇa is sporting in the boundless Joys made manifest in the devotees of the Path of Grace. This Joy is the Blessed Lord's very essence, and it has been given by Him alone. Therefore the word ' Self ' refers to the Blessed Lord."[8] Yet Joy is the Lord's alone, and so even though He has given this Joy as a gift, it is still property referred to as " His own Joy." And so Kṛṣṇa sports in the ocean of His own Joy which has been made manifest, by His gift, in the devotee.

Vallabha's next verse has a loose connection with the verse that speaks of " the person who worships Kṛṣṇa while he is still involved in Saṁsāra," and Puruṣottama points out this connection. Viṭṭhala has not commented on the verse at all. But the verse stands quite well by itself, as an independent statement, and so I shall treat it in that way.

---

[8] Skt.: *śrīkṛṣṇapadātpuṣṭimārgīyabhaktaprakaṭitaniravadhyānandeṣu viharantamityarthaḥ . . sa ānando bhagavatsvarūpātmakas-taddata eva. ata ātmapadaṁ bhagavatparam.*

lokārthī cedbhajetkṛṣṇaṁ kliṣṭo bhavati sarvathā //16b
Kliṣṭo' pi cedbhajetkṛṣṇaṁ loko naśyati sarvathā /17a

> XVIb-XVIIa. If someone worships Kṛṣṇa desiring the things of the world, affliction invariably comes to him; but if the afflicted one worships Kṛṣṇa, this world perishes utterly for him.

This verse is fairly simple and straightforward, by comparison with some of Vallabha's other verses. There is only one possible point of confusion in the present verse. That is the question of whether the same person is being spoken of in both halves of the verse, or whether one person is spoken of as being struck by affliction, while it is another person who is described as being freed from affliction by Kṛṣṇa. This latter opinion is certainly defensible, but I find the former interpretation—that a single devotee is spoken of as first led into affliction, and then out of it to freedom by Kṛṣṇa—both more meaningful and more likely in view of the Sanskrit words used. I think Vallabha is giving us an illustration of doctrine of *nirodha* [9] here, by saying that Kṛṣṇa brings affliction on his chosen devotee when the devotee desires worldly things (*lokārthī*). This is in accordance with the quotation just cited, which says that Hari will not grant His graced devotees (*puṣṭibhakta*) contentment in worldly conduct and Vedic observances. But then, when the devotee is "afflicted" (*kliṣṭo 'pi*), he realizes his helplessness (*dīnatva*) and "worships Kṛṣṇa," thus depending on Him, and Kṛṣṇa causes the world to "perish entirely for him" (*loko naśyati sarvathā*). This phrase is especially apt, because the negative effect of "constraint" is taught to be the devotee's "forgetting the world" (*prapañcavismṛti*). As mentioned above. I believe the Sanskrit words used favor this interpretation too. For in line two, the subject, *kliṣṭo* ("afflicted one") is modified by the particle *api*. And I see no other way of explaining *api* here than in its meaning: " even (that one) " or " when the same person (is afflicted)." *Api* in its frequent meaning as " also " does not, upon reflection, make much sense here. Hence my translation: " but if the (same) afflicted one worships Kṛṣṇa, this world perishes entirely for him."[10] Puruṣottama agrees completely with this interpretation, though he does not specifically mention the doctrine of *nirodha* in his explanation.

---

[9] Vallabha treats the topic of *nirodha* in considerably greater detail in "The Definition of Constraint" (*Nirodhalakṣaṇam*), the fifteenth of the sixteen verse-treatises.

jñānābhāve puṣṭimārgī tiṣṭhetpūjotsavādiṣu // 17b

maryādāsthastu gaṅgāyāṁ śrībhāgavatatatparaḥ /
anugrahaḥ puṣṭimārge niyāmaka iti sthitiḥ // 18

ubhayostu krameṇaiva pūrvoktaiva phaliṣyati /
jñānādhiko bhaktimārga evaṁ tasmānnirūpitḥ // 19

bhaktyabhāve tu tīrastho yathā duṣṭaiḥ svakarmabhiḥ /
anyathābhāvamāpannastasmātsthānācca naśyati // 20

XVIIb XVIII. In the absence of knowledge, a follower of the Path of Grace should rely on ritual worship, the festivals, and so forth, while a follower of the Path of Limitations should devote himself completely to the study of the sacred Bhāgvata on the banks of the Ganges. The firm rule is that the Lord's Grace is the only guide on the Path of Grace.

XIX. But the devotion which is characteristic of the Path of Grace will result in due course for followers of both the Path of Grace and the Path of Limitations (*OR*: will result in due course for both followers on the Path of Limitations—the sage and the devotee—as well). The Path of Devotion is superior to the Path of Knowledge. That is why I have described it thus in the analogy of the Ganges.

---

[10] There is a variant, minority reading of the words we have been discussing: *kliṣṭe* ' *pi* instead of *kliṣṭo* ' *pi* '. This reading would translate clearly: if he worships Kṛṣṇa when he is afflicted, too " or " even in his affliction," thus supporting my interpretation strongly. But I believe that even the majority reading, *kliṣṭo* '*pi*, which I have followed, is quite clear in its support, as explained above.

XX. But in the absence of devotion people attain only rebirth, just as the person who lives on the very bank of the Ganges, but is without devotion, perishes from that place because of his evil deeds, and wanders to another existence.

In the entire section concerning the soul and its way of attaining salvation, one of Vallabha's main themes was the knowledge-content of devotion. Now Vallabha addresses himself, in a clear and simple verse, to the problem of what devotees on the Path of Grace and the Path of Limitations should do to attain salvation when they have no connection with knowledge (*jñāna*) or the Path of Knowledge. What Vallabha enjoins on these devotees amounts to the more ordinary practices of *bhakti*. The devotees who are on the Path of Grace (*puṣṭimārgī* in Vallabha's text) should apply themselves constantly to ritual worship (*pūjā*), the religious festivals (*utsava*), and other similar devotions. I translate *pūjā* by " ritual worship " here rather than simply as " worship " to distinguish it from *sevā*, " worship " (with a strong connotation of service), Vallabha's key word for describing the devotee's entire attitude and practice in relation to Kṛṣṇa.

Vallabha's next half-verse stands by itself, and is one of the most important statements in the whole of his teaching. He says that Lord Kṛṣṇa's " Grace " (*anugraha*) is the only " guide " or " controlling factor " (*niyāmaka*) on the Path of Grace. And he further specifies that this is a " firm rule " (*iti sthitiḥ*). This last phrase emphasizes the point that Vallabha, who assigns all the scriptural laws and limitations to the Path of Limitations, does not leave his Path of Grace without rules. He himself assigns rules to this Path—this is the first of a number which can be found in *The Sixteen Verse-Treatises*—and these rules are to be followed strictly by Grace-devotees. I have translated the word *niyāmaka* as " guide " rather than the more literal " controlling factor " to continue Vallabha's implied image of travel and dwelling, which he introduced in the previous line by saying that the devotee on the Path of Limitations should stay in a particular place, *i.e.*, " on the banks of the Ganges." In contrast to this, Vallabha says that on the Path of Grace there is a rule only as to the " guide," not as to the place. I disagree with Viṭṭhala when he says that Vallabha's use here of the word *sthiti*—which so often means "place"—has anything to do with the continuation of this image. Rather, the usage *iti sthitiḥ* is a consecrated phrase in Vallabha's (and others') writings, which always indicates the laying down of a rule, and translates as "this is a firm rule," or "the firm rule is." Finally, the precise meaning of *niyāmaka* is that Kṛṣṇa's Grace is the factor which initiates and carries through every endeavor or accomplishment with regard to the devotee on the Path of Grace.

The first half of Vallabha's next verse is difficult because of the obscurity of its references. Vallabha says that something which has been mentioned previously (*pūrvoktaiva*) will result in due course (*krameṇaiva phaliṣyati*) "for (or "in") both" (*ubhayos*). Two questions arise immediately: what is the "something mentioned previously" and who are the "both"? Only one clue exists: the word *purvoktā* ("previously mentioned") is feminine singular, so the subject noun must also be. Viṭṭhala puts us on the trail of an answer to both questions with a very ingenious explanation. He first tells us who the "both" might be, and then what the "previously mentioned something" is: "In the line which begins with 'for both', the meaning is that, if the Lord also gives a special Grace to the sage and the devotee who are on the Path of Limitations, then these two will first attain the Path of Grace, and subsequently attain the devotion which is characteristic of that Path."[11] Thus the "both," according to Viṭṭhala, are the person who has mastered the Path of Knowledge within the Path of Limitations and the devotee on the Path of Limitations. And the "previsouly mentioned something" is "the devotion which is characteristic of the Path of Grace" (*tanmārgīyam– i.e., puṣṭimārgīyam, bhaktim*). In this latter identification I agree with Viṭṭhala completely, since *bhakti* is a feminine singular noun which has dominated the entire previous context of the treatise. The only other possible candidate would be *sevā*, "worship," the general topic of the treatise. But this has not been explicitly mentioned since verse two, and thus is scarcely possible. Now as to Viṭṭhala's interpretation of "both," I see some problems. It seems unlikely that the pronoun "both" (*ubha*—) would be used here to refer forward to the mention of the Path of Knowledge and the Path of Devotion in the next half-verse, though it is possible and Viṭṭhala seems definitely to take it in that way. It seems even less likely when one considers that Vallabha has followed the word for "both" with the adversative particle *tu* ("but"), which is almost invariably used to show a contrast with a *previous* statement. For these reasons, then, I think it more likely that the word "both" refers back to the last contrast mentioned: that between the devotee on the Path of Grace and his counterpart on the Path of Limitations in the first verse of this section. So, the "both" referred to would be the Path of Grace and the Path of Limitations. Besides, what Vallabha says here is still under the influence of the phrase "in the absence of knowledge" (verse seventeen), since that phrase is most likely intended to govern what is said up to Vallabha's words "in the absence of devotion" (verse twenty). By the word *evam* in the verse nineteen, Vallabha means, as is explained by Viṭṭhala and Gokulanātha, the gradation (*tāratamyam*), which exists in the example of Ganges: namely that Kṛṣṇa and the Path of Devotion are higher than Akṣara Brahman and the Path of Knowledge.

---

[11] Skt.: *maryādāsthāvapi jñānībhaktau cedanugṛhṇāti viśeṣataḥ, tadādau puṣṭimārgam prāpya tanmārgīyam bhaktim prāpnuta ityāhuḥ ubhayoriti.*

In the last verse Vallabha uses the analogy of Ganges for the final time, and Viṭṭhala points out the parallelism with worship of Kṛṣṇa by saying that, just as someone who lives on the bank of the Ganges simply stays in Saṁsāra if he lacks devotion, "the meaning here is that precisely the same happens to a person, even though he is situated in a place where the Blessed Lord is present, if he lacks devotion" (*bhagavatsānnidhye 'pi sthitau bhaktyabhāve tathā bhavatīti bhāvaḥ*).

evaṁ svaśāstrasarvasvam mayā guptaṁ nirūpitam/
etad buddhvā vimucyeta puruṣaḥ sarvasaṁśayāt // 21

XXI. In these verses I have explained the hidden essence of Hari's scriptures. By understanding this a person may be freed from all doubt.

The major themes of the treatise, are two: "mental worship" (*mānasī sevā*) and "devotion" (*bhakti*). "Mental worship," though it is actually mentioned and explained only in the first two verses, continues as an important unstated theme throughout. In verse twelve, the devotee is told to " fix his mind of Kṛṣṇa in accordance with our Doctrine of Brahman." And the two major realizations of Kṛṣṇa which Vallabha teaches: of the identity of Kṛṣṇa with the Self and of the presence of Kṛṣṇa, in His " ocean of Joy," within the devotee, are also obvious subjects for mental worship. The second theme, *bhakti*, is so pervasive after its introduction in verse seven that there is no need to highlight its occurrences. Important statements have also been made about the nature of the universe, of Brahman, about the relation of Kṛṣṇa to Brahman, about the nature of the soul. And finally, Vallabha has introduced, albeit in a confusing way since it frequently overlaps his distinction between the Path of Knolwedge and the Path of Devotion, his famous distinction between the Path of Grace and the Path of limitations.

LITERATURE AND CRITICISM

A CRITICAL STUDY OF THE MEGHADŪTA OF KĀLIDĀSA IN THE LIGHT OF BHARATA'S RASA-SŪTRA*

R. R. AMBARDEKAR

THE *Meghadūta* has been a very popular illustrative text with the later rhetoricians. They are seen often illustrating their concepts by drawing examples from this poem. Bhoja, Ānandavardhana, Abhinava, Rājaśekhara, Kuntaka, Mammaṭa, Viśvanātha and many more refer to the *Meghadūta*, frequently. Particular mention may be made of Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* which illustrates the Uddīpanas, Alaṁkāras, conditions of love etc.. In other words, Vyabhicārins, Sāttvikabhāvas, metre etc. from the *Meghadūta* have been illustrated. But nowhere do we find a complete analysis of the Rasa-structure of the poem, which the present thesis has attempted. The theory of Rasa was first contemplated in respect of drama, as is to be seen in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata. Later on, when it was accepted by poetics and was combined with the concept of Dhvani as in Rasadhvani by Ānandavardhana, it came to be applied to literature as well. In a sense this is justifiable, because poetry is rarely appreciated properly unless it is dramatised and fully visualised by the reader. Abhinavagupta has quoted a very relevant verse from the *Kāvyakautuka* by Bhaṭṭa Tauta, in this context. The *Meghadūta*, a Great Poem, as acknowledged by all should also answer to this description. The present study is an attempt to observe the Rasa-Structure of the individual verses and, through them, of the entire poem as a whole. It must however be granted that in matters of literary criticism and appreciation, the subjective element is bound to play its part, howsoever one might try to be objective. This being the case, the difference of opinion in such matters especially in the analysis of the Rasa Structure of the verses as attempted here is to be taken for granted. A few verses may be observed.

---

* Submitted to the University of Bombay in 1975. Published under the title *Rasa-Structure of the Meghadūta*,

Adreesha Prakashana, Bombay 1979.

Verse No. 1[1]: The Yakṣa, the hero is the Āśraya and his wife, Kāntā is the Viṣaya. The word Kāntā shows that she is a beloved wife. They are separated for the period of one year and this aspect of separation i.e. a duration of one full year, is therefore the Uddīpana. It hightens the pangs of separation—a fact indicated by the word Virahaguruṇā. The Vipralambha is said to be of five types as arising from longing, separation, jeolousy, (lover's) residence, abroad, and curse. Here it is owing to a curse (Śāpa). Vallabha however takes it as arising from journey. One would like to say that Kālidāsa himself uses the word Śāpa, and the journey indicated by Vallabha is but the consequence of the Śāpa. The separation excites the feelings of the hero who moves from place to place on the Rāmagiri mountain. This is Anubhāva, which suggests the Unmāda stage of the hero. Mallinātha puts it in a technical term—Ekatra Anavasthānam. Unmāda is one of the Vyabhicāribhāvas here, others being Āvega and Dainya. Āvega is defined as " Kriyāsu atisambhramaḥ ". As a listless person, the hero changes his residence from one hermitage to another now and then. Dainya defined as " Daurgatyādeḥ anojastvam " is suggested by the word " Astaṅgamitamahimā." The Yakṣa himself was possessed of superhuman powers Aṇimā Laghimā etc. But since he lost his powers (Mahimā) he came to the mountain Rāmagiri. The curse reduced him to the position of pity. The word Asta is suggestive, it suggests Udaya or rise. The Sthāyin of Rati with these factors is developed into Vipralambha. To Mallinātha, the references to the *Rāmāyaṇa* and Janakatanayā create an atmosphere of purity while to Vallabha, the reference to Sītā suggests the Śṛṅgāra, in the poem. The figure Udātta in the words Janakatanayāsnānapuṇyodaka and Rāmagiri also heighten the poignancy of the feelings and of the atmosphere.

The structural analysis :—

(1) Āśraya—The Yakṣa, Viṣaya—Kāntā.
(2) Uddīpana—Varṣā, Rāmagiri, Rāma, Janakatanayā.
(3) Anubhāva—Ekatra anavasthānam.
(4) Vyabhicārin—Unmāda, Āvega, Dainya.
(5) Rasa—Vipralambha based on the curse.
(6) Sthāyin—Rati.

---

[1] The numbers of verses refer to the edition by late Dr. S. K. De.

Verse No. 64 : This is a structurally perfect verse with balanced adjectives for the cloud and the city of Alakā which is the subject of description upto verse 78. As pointed out by Mallinātha, this is a clever blend of two figures, the Yathāsaṁkhya and the Pūrṇopamā. The *Alaṁkāratilaka* reads here the figure Sādṛṣyātireka and the *Alaṁkāravimarṣiṇi* notes that here the Vidyut and the Vanitāḥ are regarded as properties that bestow distinction on the cloud and the places. Dakṣiṇāvarta also notices here an effort on the part of the poet to establish some sort of relation between the cloud and the description that is being attempted.

Kālidāsian ways are subtle and the entire description of Alakā is so given as to supply the Uddīpana-vibhāvas for the continued amorous sports and the Sambhoga-Śṛṅgāra that are the only and perhaps normal life in that love city. This also makes the Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra of the Yakṣa more poignant. The cloud has unnerved him (vide—Meghāloke bhavati... etc.) and now the sight of the cloud and the memory of the palaces (Meghadarśana and the Prāsāda Smaraṇa) beautifully mingle to excite him further. The skyscrapers in Alakā, the beautiful ladies (Lalitavanitāḥ), the aristocratic music (Snigdhagamdhīraghoṣaṃ Sangītam), possibly the exciting paintings (Sacitrāḥ)—all these are the Uddīpaka and therefore the Uddīpana-Vibhāvas in Alakā for the Sambhoga and in the Yakṣa for his Vipralambha. All these are indeed the means that make love acceptable and intensify its pleasures. It is only the *Śṛṅgārāprakā'śa* that seems to have grasped the true significance of these details when it remarks in the context of this verse as *Upakaraṇamandiram Yahā* and cites this verse as its illustration.

Structural analysis—Devoted to Uddīpana only.

Verse No. 65 : If the preceding verse speaks of Uddīpanas provided by the Yakṣas, this verse speaks of those provided by Nature. The economy in Kālidāsiyan technique is at its best here. First he puts all the flowers of the different seasons at once in bloom in Alakā and therefore describes them as playing the role of ornaments and decorations for the "Lalitavanitāḥ" spoken of earlier. Thus the Kamala goes with the Śarad, the Kunda with the Hemanta, the Lodhra with the Śiśira, the Kurabaka with the Vasanta, the Śiriṣa with the Grīṣma and the Nīpa with the Varṣā. Flowers are the usual excitants (Uddīpanas) of love though tradition speaks of five flowers as the arrows of cupid. 'Secondly, this natural way of decoration speaks of the fine taste of the beautiful ladies who do not rejoice in the vulgar display of Gold and diamonds. Vallabha has rightly pointed out these two aspects (the "Sarvartusamṛddhi" and the "Nāgaratva" of the ladies. The *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* pays handsome compliments to Kālidāsa's art by reading here a mixture of different figures (Nānā-alaṁkāra-saṁsṛṣṭi). The figures according to it are the Aprastutapraśaṁsā, the Paryāyokta and the Bhāvika. The first two deal with powers of vivid description. The description is Uddīpanavibhāva for the Yakṣa as it is bound to intensify his grief at being away from this gay atmosphere. The word "Vadhū" has been deliberately used to maintain purity in this gaiety.

Structural analysis : Devoted to Uddīpana only ; Rati for nature.

Verse No. 89 : The poet has used very selective words in this verse. The simile in the last line is very rich and also suggestive. The Yakṣa as usual is the Āśraya and his wife is the Viṣaya. Her state half awake and half asleep, her eyelashes with tears in the eyes are the Anubhāvas and the Sāttvikabhāvas. They refer to her physical and mental conditions. The beams of the moon, who is the reservior of nectar, are cool as nectar. They were welcome to her before the separation but now they are a source of trouble (Sannivṛttam). She is compared with a land-lotus and not with a waterlotus. She is asleep on the ground. The wife of the Yakṣa with her eyes bedimmed with tears and lying on the ground is aptly compared to a lotus plant growing on land (Sthalakamalinī). She was neither quite awake (opened) nor quite asleep (closed) because she simply shut her eyes, being tormented at the sight of the moon-rays, however, she could not enjoy sleep on account of excessive anxiety. The words Chādayantī, Prabuddhā, Suptā are important in this connection. The lotus that opens at the sight of the Sun and closes at the Sunset does neither of these actions completely on account of the cloudy day when it is neither sunshine nor dark. Closing the eyes shows the Vyabhicārin Jaḍatā. Another Vyabhicārin Kheda (Vācya) is expressed in the third line. The comparision of the wife of the Yakṣa to a land-lotus-plant adds to the creation of the sad mood. It is a case of Alaṁkāreṇa Vastu-Vyañjita. The Sthāyin Rati with Karuṇa contributes to the Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra.

Structural analysis :—

(1) Āśraya—The Yakṣa ; Viṣaya—His wife.

(2) Uddīpana—Viraha.

(3) Anubhāva—Chādayantī, Prabuddhā, Suptā.

(4) Vyabhicārin—Jaḍatā, Kheda.

(5) Rasa—Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra with Karuṇa.

(6) Sthāyin—Rati.

Such is the analysis of the verses of the *Meghadūta* from the Rasa and Bhāva point of view. As already remarked, a difference of views as regards the details is but natural. This analyis, howsoever necessary for a proper appreciation of a verse, cannot be an end in itself. After all a verse is a part of the whole poem. Hence an attempt is made to understand the *Meghadūta* as a unitary whole and to deduce certain conclusions regarding the poem as well as the aesthetic view of Kālidāsa essentially based on the material collected here.

The *Meghadūta*, is traditionally held to be a poem with Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra as its dominant Rasa, as is clearly, asserted by Mallinātha—"*Atra Raso Vipralambhākhyaḥ Śṛṅgāraḥ.*" The poem has for its theme the separation of the Yakṣa and his wife whose names are nowhere metioned from the beginning to the end. There are references to the separation and the intention of the poet should be regarded as obvious in his repeated use of words such as Viraha (1,8,12,29,82,84,86,88,91,107,109), Viprayukta (2), Viśleṣita (7), Viprayoga (10,85,111), Viyukta (98) Viyoga (77, 105). The hero here is the Āśrayālambana while his wife is the Viṣayālambana. Urvaśī, for example, is the Viṣayālambana for king Purūrvas in the Fourth Act of the *Vikramorvaśīya*. The circumstances and the situations which remind them of each other and arouse and intensify their feelings become Uddīpanavibhāvas. In the case of the *Meghadūta*, the advent of the rainy season, the appearance of the cloud, rivers, cool breeze, are Uddīpanas because it is these factors which remind the hero of the heroine, make him restless and pine for her company. He could not bear the pangs of separation and his restlessness if reflected in his change of abode from place to place on the mountain Rāmagiri. Technically viewed this Ekatra Anavasthānam, suggested by the significant plural Rāmagiryāśrameṣu is the Anubhāva. The hero wanted to send by a cloud, a message to the heroine, in order to give solace to her and sustain her in her misery (Verse 4). His incapability to distinguish between the animate and the inanimate object shows his madness known as 'Unmāda.' According to Bharata, the author of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, this madness is one of the Avasthās-stages. The Yakṣa is in the stage of madness. This Unmāda is, therefore, the Vyabhicāribhāva in the poem. Rati, the Sthāyin develops into Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra. This is the analysis of the *Meghadūta*, taken as a unitary whole, according to Mallinātha.

The *Meghadūta* is also known as the *Yakṣasandeśa*. It may be suggested that both the titles are significant. The *Meghadūta* giving prominance to the Megha would refer to the Sambhoga Śṛṅgāra, whereas the *Yakṣasandeśa* giving prominance to the Yakṣa would refer to the Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra. Rati is the common Sthāyibhāva for both these aspects of erotic sentiment. In this respect the role of the cloud is very important. Just as there is a pair of the Yakṣa and his wife, there is another pair of the cloud and the lightning. It may be suggested that it is in the cloud that we find the usual typical Kālidāsian hero with many beloveds. In the case of the Yakṣa, however, he has maintained the atmosphere of purity and fidelity, with the exception of a solitary sly reference to his flirtation (Kaulīna, 109). This second pair is important for the Sambhoga Śṛṅgāra. The Yakṣa is therefore what he is, and the cloud is what he wishes to be. The work thus delineates both the aspects of the Erotic sentiment. In fact, when we read the geographical or natural descriptions in the Pūrvamegha, we have to forget that the Yakṣa is the hero, who simply plays the role of a narrator.

Along with these two phases of Śṛṅgāra, there are a few stray examples of Vatsala, Bhakti, Vīra, Hāsya, Adbhuta and Śānta Rasas. All verses are therefore important. Some of them are important from the point of view of completion of a particular Rasa, some are devoted to the delineation of the Uddīpanavibhāva, and others describe nature.

Conclusion :

The *Meghadūta* could be regarded as a rainbow of seven colours in the form of seven sentiments, these being Śṛṅgāra, Bhakti, Adbhuta, Vīra, Hāsya, Vatsala and Śānta. This is its Rasacchāyā in place of Ratnacchāyā (Verse 15).

From the analysis it would be clear that Kālidāsa delineates both the types of Śṛṅgāra viz. Sambhoga and Vipralambha. For the delineation of the love in union Kālidāsa has used pairs like the cloud and Vetravatī (2) the cloud and Nirvindhyā (3) the cloud and the Gambhīrā (4) the cloud and Vidyut, (5) the mountain Kailāsa and the city Alakā, so on and so forth. In all these pictures, the poet has described the proper Anubhāvas and brought out the mental conditions of each and has succeeded in bestowing the human personality on rivers. Incidentally, he has also shown the Khaṇḍitā type of heroine and the hero in the Sun-Nalinī episode (39).

The poet delineates love in separation. The Yakṣa is the hero and his beloved wife is the heroine. In delineating love in separation, between the Nāyaka and the Nāyikā, Kālidāsa uses very significant phraseology to describe the individuals and their physical and mental conditions. Both the pictures are so pathetic, that one as a critic, would sympathize with them, and this sympathy is necessary for Sādhāraṇīkaraṇa.

The metre Mandākrāntā used throughout the poem significantly contributes to the deepening of this atmosphere. In selecting Mandākrāntā, the poet has won half the battle. Mandākrāntā is pre-eminently suited to a poem descriptive of the rainy season, travel and calamities. Hustle and bustle clashes with the very structure of this metre. The *Meghadūta* combines all the three particulars. As the name itself signifies, Mandākrāntā with its slow and heavy movement is best suited for the subject here. Just as Vālmiki uses Anuṣṭubha to describe the pathos of a Krauñca pair, Kālidāsa uses Mandākrāntā to describe the pathos of the Yakṣa and the Yakṣapatnī. Daṇḍin classifies the *Meghadūta* under Saṅghāta, a poem written on the subject in one metre only.

To Kālidāsa, love was not all-in-all in life. Bhakti was an equally important and dominating emotion of the human heart. That is why the love that he depicts, thrives, in the presence of deities. He deliberately places Śiva on the outskirts of Alakā (7). It is, therefore, natural that he should make the cloud, who has the freedom to move (Kāmacārin) to visit a good many places and sacred spots and pay his homage to deities concerned. These spots were sacred and dear to Kālidāsa's contemporary Indian minds. The analysis of the verses where the sentiment of Bhakti is delineated, would clearly reveal that this under current of Bhakti is too strong to be neglected altogether. It is in itself a powerful current that lends a certain sublimity to the love-poem which is otherwise sensual in concept and phraseology.

General atmosphere of the poem is certainly not favourable to the introduction of the Heroic sentiment (Vīra Rasa) in its structure. Kālidāsa seems constitutionally not prone to depicting the Vīra Rasa ; nor does he relish it. It is not surprising therefore that the Vīra has a certain element of softness about it. The Vīra Rasa is connected with Utsāha of the cloud. In the example of Gāṇḍīvadhanvā, Vīra is combined with Bhakti (48). The cloud is asked to quench the forest fire (53) and to scatter away the Śarabhas (54). These are the places where the Vīra comes in, in a manner, which does not disturb the general langurous and melodious atmosphere of the poem.

In keeping with the general delicasy and softness of the poem, Kālidāsa has introduced the mild Adbhuta in two verses (14, 46). The Adbhuta has Vismaya as its basis. There are two verses (61-62) in which there is a delineation of the very pleasant type of Hāsya. This is not the gross Hāsya which arises from something incongruous or inappropriate, that is coarse or broad Hāsya. Kālidāsa's love poem could not adjust anything coarse and hence the finer type of Hāsya.

There is only one verse (44) where there is a subtle delineation of the Bhāva or Rasa later on recognised as Vātsalya. Kālidāsa uses the word "Putraprema" in the context. It is very artistically delineated in this verse. Pārvatī decorates her ear with a feather of the peacock the vehicle of her son Kumāra Kārtikeya. Everything in Kālidāsa is multipurpose and this Anubhāva of Pārvatī delicately brings out her own fine taste and love of beauty and lustre as well as the regard for her son.

In one verse (49) occurs the delineation of Śāntarasa. Balarāma discarded his favourite wine reflecting Revatī's eyes and also refused to participate in the War (Samaravimukha), and therefore has a disgust in his mind (Vairāgya). In order to atone for a murder of a brahmin, he repaired to the river Saraswatī, for sipping its water. These are appropriate Anubhāvas, and complete freedom and purification (Antaḥśuddhi) is an ultimate consequence. The entire atmosphere of the stanza therefore is favourable to the relishing of the Śāntarasa.

The pleasures of the seasons, the enjoyment of garlands, unguents, ornaments, the company of beloved persons, object of senses, splendid mansions, going to gardens, enjoying oneself there, playing and dallying with beloved persons, moon-light, fragrance, cool breeze are the Uddīpakas. They enhance or add to the development of the sentiment. The poet has used 32 stanzas to the Uddīpanavibhāva.

Anubhāvas are the effect of the Vibhāvas on the mind and their reaction and changes on the body. In short they are physical activities. There are 10 verses devoted to Anubhāvas mainly describing the physical activities of the heroine. Sāttvikabhāvas are subdivisions of the Anubhāva. Bharata has recognised eight Sāttvikabhāvas while Kālidāsa has used only four. They are Romāñca or Pulakita, Tears, Vaivarṇya and Stambha.

Vyabhicārins are accessories. They are not strictly confined to any Rasa in particular. Four verses are devoted to the Vyabhicārin where the poet describes Pralāpa of the hero. Out of 33 Vyabhicārins recognised by Bharata, Kālidāsa does not use specific five Viz. Nirveda, Mada, Moha, Ugratā and Maraṇa. In addition the poet uses Sneha, Prīti, Utkaṇṭhā, recognised by later rhetoricians.

The *Meghadūta* is an excellent poem where the poet uses Dhvani in all the three senses—Vastudhvani Alaṁkāradhvani and Rasadhvani. Rasa and Vyabhicārins are Vācya at some places. Ārādhanā (45) is the Anubhāva of Bhakti. There is only one example of Bhāvaśānti (36). There is hardly any example of Rasābhāsa in the *Meghadūta*.

An effort has thus been made to lay bare the Rasa-Bhāva structure of the *Meghadūta*. Kālidāsian works are master pieces, whether a prose sentence or a verse, they are deceptively simple. The analysis of Rasa-structure is indeed an attempt to go to the roots of the aesthetic delight that a literary work gives. The *Meghadūta* is usually regarded as one of the best works of Kālidāsa, probably produced when he was a mature poet. Our study of the Anubhāvas has confirmed this. Kālidāsa has also his own preferences in matters of Rasa, particularly for the Sambhoga, and the Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra, the Narma Hāsa, the soft Adbhuta, and occasionally the Vīra going hand in hand. With his superior taste and delicate sensitivity, he could never think of delineating the Bhayānaka, the Bībhatsa and the Raudra Rasas. Our study of the Sthāyins confirms this. Views about Rasābhāsa, Svaśabdavācyatva and the like are to be understood from his practice; for, he was not a theorist. His acquaintance with fine arts is very close and so is his acquaintance with Bharata. This study is therefore expected to throw light on Kālidāsa's workmanship, his aesthetic views and the process to discover the essentially poetical element in the *Meghadūta* on which the emotional appeal of the poem rests.

NATURE AND SCOPE OF SANSKRIT LITERARY CRITICISM AS SEEN IN SANSKRIT COMMENTARIES*

SUDHA S. BHIDE

IT is generally held that though Sanskrit poetics has attained the height of perfection in the discussion of literary principles and excellences, Sanskrit critics and scholars have neglected to use these principles as the criterion of evaluation of a literary work, i.e. Sanskrit commentaries are not worthy of bearing the name of criticism relating to them.

With this point of view a close study of some commentaries on a number of well-known Sanskrit plays, the five great Sanskrit literary epics and the *Meghadūta*, was carried out in this thesis. In such a close study of all these various commentaries, the immense wealth of erudition, the great capacity of literary appreciation, and the ability of delightfully expressive use of Sanskrit language on the part of Sanskrit commentaries, was clearly revealed. The study of the works of these commentators led to the conclusion that, not only were they great scholars in their own fields, but also they were real appreciators or *sahṛdaya rasikas* of the works they commented upon.

In dealing with Sanskrit commentaries, it must, however, be remembered that modern ideas about literary criticism were not in existence when the Sanskrit commentaries were written. Therefore, it would not be correct and just to judge them in the light of modern ideas and theories of criticism. Moreover, the principles of excellence as laid down by the Sanskrit poetics are of quite a different nature from those that are prevelent in the modern time. When examining and evaluating any work composed at a particular period of time, the standards of evaluation existent at that particular period of time should be applied. As the types of criticism that are acceptable today were not in existence in the time when these commentaries were written, it is no wonder that these commentaries fall short of the expectations of modern tests of good literary criticism.

---

* Submitted to the University of Poona in 1966.

This, however, does not mean that these commentaries are of little or no value. It will be quite unjust on the part of the modern scholar if he declares these commentaries to be entirely textual criticism explaining only the meanings and etymologies of words, because our critical study of the dramas and the poetical works in classical Sanskrit reveals that these Sanskrit commentaries do fulfil the basic expectations of the science of literary criticism. These commentators are evidently good critics whose aim is to help the reader to understand and appreciate more fully the works of literary artists. The functions of literary criticism embody the judgement of merits and demerits of a work, explanation of suggestions and imagery and the elucidation of points of artistic beauty as also of the devices used by the poet to enhance the beauty of his work. It is evident that Sanskrit commentators have proved themselves equal to this task.

These commentaries include the discussion of literary merits and flaws. Works are judged by the standards laid down by Sanskrit poetics. They explain the noteworthy points of style and artistic beauty as also the Rasas, Bhāvas and Alaṁkāras which have the purpose of enriching the beauty of a literary piece. These commentaries, moreover, have thrown light on the technical side and formal excellence of the works they have commented upon. All this goes to show that these commentaries have tried to carry out the functions of literary criticism according to the modern conceptions.

Textual discussions cover a very large part of the Sanskrit commentaries since they explain the text, discuss the readings, solve the compounds and offer considerable help in properly and correctly understanding a text.

Technical criticism also is seen to occupy a very important place in these commentaries since they offer analysis of the construction of the Sanskrit dramas in their discussions of the five Sandhis and in their discussions of the characteristics of an epic etc. in case of the poetical compositions.

Their discussions of literary excellence, their explanations of the Rasas, the Bhāvas and the Alaṁkāras can easily be regarded as aesthetic criticism.

In this manner we can classify the Sanskrit commentaries as answering the different types of literary criticism though it must be said that they do not belong to any single type.

Sanskrit commentators to judge from their commentaries, seem to be really very well equipped with various qualities which are, indeed, essential for a good critic.

The literary background of these critics is itself a sound proof of their extensive and profound knowledge. The list of authorities quoted by these commentators is so varied and covers such a vast field of knowledge that they evoke admiration for their scholarship. They have invariably quoted from and referred to authorities on sciences such as Poetics (the *Kāvyādarśa*, the *Kāvyaprakāśa*, the *Kāvyālaṁkārasūtras*), as also the Kāvyaśātra ; Grammar (the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, the *Mahābhāṣya*, the *Vārtikas*); Dramaturgy (the *Nāṭyaśāsrta*, the *Daśarūpaka*, the *Pratāparudrīya* and many others) ; Medicine ; Astrology and Astronomy ; Music ; Śakunaśāstra, as also to the *Vedas*, the *Brāhmaṇas*, the *Āraṇyakas*, the *Upaniṣads* and the *Sūtras*, the *Smṛtis*, the *Purāṇas*, the *Mahābhārata*, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, works on rituals and the Dharmaśastras. The lexicons they know and quote from are many in number ; Kośas such as the *Amarakośa*, the *Vaijayantī*, the *Viśvaprakāśa*, the *Yādavaprakāśa*, the *Ratnamālā*, the *Śabdamālā*, the *Śabdārṇava*, *Keśava*, *Medinī* and other *Kośas* have been pressed into service. Besides these authorities, these commentators have also quoted from many unnamed works and from authors who are mere names to us. These commentators knew not only the Sanskrit language but also knew the Prakrit dilects such as the Śaurasenī the Mahārāṣṭrī and the other dilects used in Sanskrit dramas. This is seen in their discussion of the Deśi forms of Sanskrit words. All this clearly proves that these Sanskrit commentators had a deep and sound knowledge of the different subjects which indeed go to make a man a truly great scholar and to provide him with proper equipment of a critic.

The second equally important quality, the ability to discriminate between the merits and the demerits is very well revealed in their explanations of the literary excellence. They have pointed out the merits as well as the demerits in the works they have commented upon. It is true that in most cases these commentators have more than often justified the flaws rather than condemned them. But this is due to the sympathetic outlook these commentators had for the authors and it does not mean that they were ignorant of either their merits or their demerits. Moreover, they valued and recognised the freedom of the poets in creating a literary piece without paying heed to the tyrany of the rules of poetics. Sympathy again is the quality held as very necessary for a good critic, and Sanskrit commentators possess this in ample measure.

The ability to understand the gist of the literary piece is revealed in their discussions of the allusions and suggestions, the *Dhvani*. The quality of impartiality is also revealed by almost all of these Sanskrit commentators. They are sympathetic towards the authors, but they are never carried away too far by their sympathy. Even Ghanaśyāma who finds many faults with Bhavabhūti is never too harsh against him and his comments are rarely unjust. All these commentators, it may be said with justification, neither scorn nor flatter the authors. Theirs is a role of an appreciative reader who is ever ready to appreciate the merits yet who is fully aware of the flaws and shortcomings.

The last and perhaps the most important quality that of having a real taste for literature and the capacity to appreciate the subtle beauties, *Rasikatā*, is seen to be present in a pre-eminent degree in all these commentators. Mallinātha's opening remarks in his commentaries on the five literary epics clearly show that he knew and understood the real greatness and excellence of these authors. At the same time he understands the importance of a really good commentary. He had a deep reverence for Kālidāsa, he considered Bhāravi great but difficult to understand, he regarded Māgha's work as product of scholarship and so considered himself fortunate, *Dhanya*, in having the opportunity of commenting on his poem. All this only shows that Mallinātha had all the qualities and the capacities of a great critic.

Like Mallinātha, Rāghavabhaṭṭa also must be regarded as a great critic, and his commentary on the Śākuntala must be taken, by all standards, a great work. He has revealed us the greatness of Kālidāsa as a poet and as a dramatist.

Pūraṇasaraswati, Jaggadhara, Dhuṇḍirāja and others also have tried their best to analyse, interpret and understand the works they studied and it would be unjust to condemn all these commentaries as nothing but mere verbal explanations of original works. To a reader who is very well acquainted with the scientific terminology of Dramaturgy and Poetics, these commentaries are bound to reveal beauties and significant aspects of the Sanskrit compositions which an ordinary reader will probably overlook. It must be necessarily considered that not all the commentators are conscious of their role as critics and one may feel disappointed while reading Rucipati and others, but then it would be also unjust to condemn all Sanskrit commentaries as trite and worthless explanations when we have Mallinātha, Rāghavabhaṭṭa, Pūrṇasaraswati, Sthiradeva and others before us. Mallinātha, Rāghavabhaṭṭa are names which must be remembered as critics along with those of the great Abhinavagupta, Kuntaka and such other theorists who are all undoubtedly great minds.

COMMENTARIES ON THE UTTARARĀMACARITA

A CRITICAL STUDY*

JAYA CHANDRAMOULI

Sanskrit literature has been enriched over the centuries not only by numerous creative works in various fields of knowledge but also by commentaries on the original works by successive generations of Sanskrit scholars. The volume of literature constituted by commentaries is so vast and extensive as to rightfully form a distinct species of Sanskrit literature. The commentaries on various classical works like the Pañca-Mahākāvyas, other Kāvyas and dramas etc. have been sadly neglected, due to the general belief that these commentaries are not worth much. But one would accept that it is not fair to pass judgement and decry these commentaries, perhaps even without an effort to read them with the attention and consideration due to them. Keeping this in mind, this present work, a comparative study of the commentaries on the *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti, has been undertaken.

The commentaries have been collected with the help of the information cited in *Catalogus Catalogorum* by Theodor Aufrecht, the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* by V. Raghavan and *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature* (*1970*) by M. Krishnamachariar. After a critical examination of the details of the commentaries listed by the above three sources, including a personal examination of the Mss. of some of the commentaries at various libraries it has been possible to collect 15 commentaries on the *Uttararāmacarita*. The commentaries included in the study are as follows :—

	Title	*Author*	*Remarks*
1.	*Apekṣitavyākhyāna*	Bhaṭṭa (Bhadra) Nārāyaṇa	Ms. Sanskrit College, Benaras
2.	*Bhāvārthadīpikā*	Nārāyaṇa (Namboodiri)	Published (1932.) Govt. Oriental Mss. Library, Madras

---

* Submitted to the University of Bombay in 1977.

	Title	*Author*	*Remarks*
3.	*Sañjīvana*	Ghanaśyāma	Published(1962)
4.	*Bhāvatalasparśinī*	Vīrarāghava	—do— (1915)
5.	Commentary	Premacandra Tarkavāgīśa	—do— (1862)
6.	Commentary	Īśvaracandra Vidyāsāgara.	—do— (1876)
7.	*Bhāvabodhinī*	Rāmacandra-budhendra.	—do— (1882) (Telugu Script) Sanskrit College, Bangalore.
8.	Commentary	Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara.	Published(1911)
9.	*Bhāvārthabodhikā*	B. S. Ghate	—do— (1895)
10.	*Saralā*	Lakṣmaṇa Sūri	Published, Govt. Oriental Library, Mysore.
11.	*Kalā*	Kumāra Tātārya	Published (Telugu script) Govt. Oriental Library, Mysore
12.	*Candrakalā* and *Vidyotinī*.	Śeṣarājaśarmā	Published(1966) Sanskrit College, Bangalore.
13.	*Laghu vyākhyā*	Anonymous	Ms. Transcription, Govt. Oriental Mss. Library, Madras.
14.	Commentary (I)	—do—	—do—
15.	Commentary (II)	—do—	—do—

Apart from these, the following three texts of the *Uttararāmacarita* have also been included for textual criticism.

1. *Uttararāmacarita*—Ed. M. R. Kale, (1934).
2. *Uttararāmacarita*—Ed. Saradaranjan Ray, (1954).
3. *Uttararāmacarita* —Ed. Janardan Pandey, (1963).

Apekṣitavyākhyāna by Bhaṭṭa (Bhadra) Nārāyaṇa :

As the list indicates, *Apekṣitavyākhyāna* of Bhaṭṭa (Bhadra) Nārāyaṇa is the oldest commentary on the *Uttararāmacarita*. The commentator was a resident of Varanasi and a great scholar in the various branches of learning. He appears to have been a deeply religious person by nature. He was a devout Vaiṣṇava and a devotee of Rāma.

The title of the commentary '*Apekṣitavyākhyāna*' aptly justifies the intentions of the commentator who wants to explain those neglected or unattended verses in the *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti—*aprasiddha padam yat tat*. Thus, the commentary discusses and explains in great detail whatever the commentator thought were 'Apekṣita' in Bhavabhūti's masterpiece. With this in mind one can understand E. B. Cowell's remarks that "Bhadra Nārāyaṇa's commentary is a very inferior performance" or Īśvaracandra Vidyāsāgara's remarks that 'Nārāyaṇa's commentary is very terse, many difficult passages have been altogether skipped.' Bhaṭṭa (Bhadra) Nārāyaṇa displays a good command over various ancient dramaturgical theories and profusely quotes from the *Amara*, *Halāyudha*, *Haima*, etc.. The commentary does not contribute much in the discussion of Rasa or Alaṁkāras or other aesthetic aspects dealt in the drama.

Bhāvārthadīpikā by Nārāyaṇa :

Nārāyaṇa, a native of Kerala, was most probably a contemporary of Bhaṭṭa (Bhadra) Nārāyaṇa of Varanasi. He claims to be the first disciple of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa (Bhaṭṭātiri), the composer of the famous panegyric, *Nārāyaṇīyam*.

The title of the commentary, '*Bhāvārthadīpikā*', which he explains as '*dīpikaiva yato bhāvān gūḍhānapi vibhāvayet*', speaks for itself, that the chief purpose of the commentary is to expound the hidden meaning of the play and the commentary is ample proof of Nārāyaṇa's intentions and his achievement. Nārāyaṇa deals and discusses all the possible aspects. We find the commentator entering into interesting discussions with utmost ease in all the varied fields of learning, with quotations to support his contentions, displaying Nārāyaṇa's vast and varied learning. It is, by far, one of the best commentaries on the play and a good representation of a model traditional commentary on a Sanskrit dramatic masterpiece.

Sañjīvana by Ghanaśyāma :

Sañjivana of Ghanaśyāma is a very well known commentary on the *Uttararāmacarita* of Bhavabhūti. Ghanaśyāma is perhaps the most communicative of all the commentators and furnishesd great details about himself. He himself gives the date of his birth, which is calculated as A.D. 1700 by J. B. Chaudhari, ('Sanskrit Poet Ghanaśyāma,' *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. 19, p. 237). He also tells us that he was a minister of king Tukkoji of the Chola dynasty who is identified with king Tukkoji of Tanjore who ruled from A.D. 1728 to 1735 (P. V. Kane, *Uttararāmacarita*, 1915, intro p. xviii).

Ghanaśyāma was a highly learned person and there is ample evidence of his vast and varied learning displayed in the commentary. He calls himself a '*Kośāvalīvallabha*' and one may have to accede to him the title as evidenced by his mastery over the innumerable lexicons from which he draws his quotations. Ghanaśyāma was a poet himself and gives a list of a number of works in Sanskrit, Prakrit and other vernaculars. But all his impressive scholarship was completely defiled by his excessive self-conciet and the title of his commentary *Sañjīvana* is very much in keeping with his genuine feeling that the credit of making the authors (whose works he chooses to comment upon) immortal, is really due to his genius ! Ghanaśyāma's performance as a commentator is not a creditable one, as it is too brief to do justice to Bhavabhūti.

Bhāvatalasparśinī by Vīrarāghava :

This commentary, variously called '*Talasparśinī*,' '*Bhāvatalasparśinī*', or '*Bhavabhūtibhāvatalasparśinī*', is also one of the widely known commentaries on the *Uttararāmacarita*. He was a native of South India and his date of birih is stated as AD 1770 by

Krishnamacariar, (*History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*, p. 624). There is proof, however, of the fact that he was either a contemporary of Ghanaśyāma or later than Ghanaśyāma, whose theories he discusses and criticises.

Vīrarāghava reveals himself to be a staunch Vaiṣṇava as he quotes profusely from South Indian Vaiṣṇava literature. Inspite of his impressive learning, Vīrarāghava is all humility about his capacity to explain the depth of Bhavabhūti's speech. The title '*Bhavabhūtibāvatalasparśinī*,' is an eloquent proof of Vīrarāghava's great respect and admiration for Bhavabhūti and his thoughts. Vīrarāghava shows himself to be a true connoisseur, pointing out the Alaṁkāras, discussing the Rasa and Bhāva at great length and above all, a master of the art of exposition. His interpretation of certain passages and verses are brilliant pieces on the art of exposition. With due emphasis on all the aspects that go into the composition of a drama, Vīrarāghava can be said to have achieved admirable success in his effort to reach the bottom of the feeling of Bhavabhūti !

Commentary by Premacandra Tarkavāgīśa :

Premacandra was a native of Bengal and a teacher of Rhetorics at the Sanskrit College. He mentions that he wrote this commentary on the request by E. B. Cowell, probably for the students. The commentary is very brief as well as simple. Though a Professor of Rhetorics, Premacandra has not dealt with those aspects in the drama, nor does he make any significant contribution in the aesthetic appreciation of the *Uttararāmacarita*.

Commentary by Īśvaracandra Vidyāsāgara :

Fortunately, unlike many other commentators, much material is available on Īśvaracandra Vidyāsāgara who was not only a well known figure in the Bengali and Sanskrit literature, but was also a renowned social reformer of Bengal. He was born in AD. 1820 to poor Brahmin parents but through his sheer learning became the most outstanding personality in the middle and final decades of 19th century. This commentary on the *Uttararāmacarita* is to be considered more as a critical edition of the *Uttararāmacarita* than a traditional commentary. Of course, Īśvaracandra does not claim to have attempted a commentary, hence it is no wonder that the nature, scope and treatment of the commentary is in keeping with the intention of preparing an edition for the students and totally lacking in the discussions or explanations on the finer aspects of the drama.

Bhāvabodhinī by Rāmacandrabudhendra

Nothing much is known about this commentator except that Rāmacandrabudhendra was a resident of Varanasi. Since his commentary is published in the Telugu Script, one is led to believe that probably, originally Rāmacandrabudhendra was a native of Andhra region. The invocation leads one to believe that he was a Vaiṣṇava and was truly devoted to Rāma.

Rāmacandrabudhendra calls himself by phrases like '*Vidvān*' and '*Viduṣām varenya*' on the one hand and tries to be humble by stating '*Kvāhamatyantabāliśaḥ,*' etc.. The title of the commentary is *Bhāvabodhinī*, as Rāmacandra calls Bhavabhūti's work as '*atiguptabhāvā kṛtiḥ*', and hence an attempt to bring out those hidden meanings. But the actual performance of Rāmacandrabudhendra falls too short of his promises expressed with high sounding words in the beginning of the commentary, as the commentary is too brief and in nature similar to the edited commentaries of Premacandra and Īśvaracandra cited above and totally dissimilar to the commentaries of Nārāyaṇa or Vīrarāghava.

This study also deals with a word by word comparison of the commentaries of Īśvaracandra Vidyāsāgara and Rāmacandrabudhendra to clear charges of plagiarism on the part of Īśvaracandra Vidyāsāgara, made by P. V. Kane and C. Sankararama Sastry. But the conflict of authorship of the commentary, claimed by both Īśvaracandra and Rāmacandrabudhendra as their own, cannot be resolved, due to the perplexity of the problem as well as lack of full information regarding Rāmacandrabudhendra.

Sukhabodhinī by Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara

Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara was born in 1844 in Kalua in Bengal. He studied in the Sanskrit College and earned the title of 'Vidyāsāgara'. The title of his commentary '*Sukhabodhinī*' justifies Jīvānanda's intentions of composing an exhaustive commentary '*Sukhabodhārtham*' and a very faithful attempt to explain Bhavabhūti's drama in all its aspects. Jīvānanda was probably a grammarian and philologist or was more interested in these two aspects so as to give equivalents of difficult Sanskrit words in Bengali, sometimes in Hindi and even in English. His contribution for a better understanding of the Alaṁkāras and Bhāvas are equally significant.

Bhāvarthābodhikā by B. S. Ghate

Bhāvaārthabodhikā by Bhaṭṭoji Śāstrī Ghate is yet another published commentary included in this study. Fortunately Ghate himself tells us about himself and the date of the composition of his commentary (A.D. 1895). He was born in A.D. 1834, at Talegaon Dasasahasra in Vidarbha. Bhaṭṭoji Śāstrī was greatly venerated for his learning. Several well known Professors of Nagpur, such as MM. Keshavrao Tamhan, MM. Sadashiv Jayaram Dehadraya, Professor Jathar and Professor G. K. Garde were his students. Ghate himself received the title of Mahāmahopādhyāya from the Viceroy of India in A.D.1900. The commentary, though in style and nature more similar to the edited commentaries of Īśvaracandra and Premacandra, is complete and deals with almost all the aspects of the drama, though briefly. Ghate is the only commentator who has meticulously pointed out the Rasa, Bhāva and Dhvani in almost all instances.

Saralā by Lakṣmaṇa Sūrī :

Saralā by Pandit Lakṣmaṇa Sūrī is also a published commentary. The commentator gives the information that he was born in A.D. 1859 and was a resident of Harikesavanaluri, a village on the river Tanuprapasni in South India. Pandit Lakṣmaṇa Sūrī had made an intensive study of the Vyākaraṇa and the Vedānta and had deep erudition in both. He took up the profession of teaching and many of his students later became well known scholars amongst whom mention may be made of late MM. Kuppuswami Sastrigal. He himself wrote many works apart from writing commentaries on the celebrated classics.

This commentary *Saralā* is written in a simple style. Though much recent in time his style is like the traditional commentators and the scope too is comprehensive. Alaṁkāras, Sandhis and Sandhyaṅgas are pointed out and discussed. Emphasis is laid on the grammatical details of words and expressions. Lakṣmaṇa Sūrī points out which verses of the *Uttararāmacarita* occur in the other two dramas of Bhavabhūti as also the verses which are taken as illustrations in the works on dramaturgy.

Kalā by Kumāra Tātārya :

This is yet another published commentary included in the study. As stated by the commentator himself, the commentary is an elaborate one and probably the largest of the commentaries on the *Uttararāmacarita*. Nothing much is known about the commentator except that he passed away in A.D. 1923 (Krishnamacariar, *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*, p.624). The commentary explains, defines and discusses the drama in all the possible angles. His Rasa analysis is an illuminating and interesting part of the commentary. He is one of the commentators making a bold declaration on the controversy about the dominant Rasa of the drama, that it is Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra only. The commentary has tried to combine in itself the traditional method as well as the modern outlook and hence, can be considered best for a modern student of the *Uttararāmacarita*.

Candrakalā Vidyotinī by ŚeṣarājaŚarmā :

It is a typical modern edited commentary, where the word commentary is to be used in its broadest sense. It is an elaborate attempt at explaining the *Uttararāmacarita* in the simplest possible manner. Mention must be made of the effort the commentator has put in pointing out the Alaṁkāras in almost all the verses of the drama.

Three anonymous commentaries are also included in the study whose contribution is significant in parts.

Aesthetic Aspects of the Commentaries :

The commentator's assistance in the Aesthetic appreciation of the drama has been considered the most essential one. The commentators have revealed great poetic sensitivity and pointed out the excellences of the *Uttararāmacarita*.

Rasa :

As is well known, there is a traditional controversy regarding the dominent Rasa in Bhavabhūti's *Uttararāmacarita*, some feel that it is Karuṇa while others state that it is Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra. The study of the commentary reveals that while commentators like Kumāra Tātārya, Premacandra and Jīvānanda have definite opinions that it is a case of Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra, others like Vīrarāghava and Nārāyaṇa, who prefer to traverse the middle path and let the controversy alone by clever handling of the instances. Still others are found to be passive about the controversy altogether. The opinion of these commentators, are based mainly on the general remarks, the interpretation of phrases associated with the words ' Karuṇa ', ' Vipralambha ' and ' Śoka ' wherever they occur in the play, as well as the interpretation of the verse ' *eko rasaḥ karuṇa* ' which has sparked off the controversy. Kumāra Tātārya, Premacandra and Jīvānanda and the author of an anonymous commentary have clearly stated that ' Karuṇa-Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra ' is the dominent Rasa of the *Uttararāmacarita*. Nārāyaṇa does not reveal an emphatic attitude but seems to believe that the drama shows dominance of Karuṇa Rasa which extends all through the drama but only till the final reunion, and hence results in Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra. His analysis is a very fine piece of essay on the Rasa in general and with reference to the *Uttararāmacarita* in particular. Ghanaśyāma is the only commentator, who, inspite of revealing a rather stern and unsympathetic attitude towards Bhavabhūti on numerous occasions, shows a liberal view about Bhavabhūti's choice of Karuṇa as the dominent Rasa and quotes the rules that give scope for option by the inclusion of the term ' *prāyikau* ' in the *Daśarūpaka* definition. The views of other commentators are passive in as much as they just explain and not discuss in great length. While Vīrarāghava who has contributed valuable arguments otherwise, is strangely defensive while explaining the word 'Karuṇa' in the sense of '*iṣṭajanaviyogajanyaduḥkhātiśayaḥ*' throughout the commentary. Ghate, Lakṣmaṇa Sūrī and Kumāra Tātārya have pointed out the Rasa and Bhāva in other instances also.

Alaṁkāras :

The significance of the help rendered by these commentators for the appreciation of Alaṁkāras employed by Bhavabhūti is equally great. A comparative and critical study of the observations of these commentators leads one to believe that indicating the employment of Alaṁkāras is given a subjective opinion in the matter. Inspite of the fact that theorists have clearly spelt out certain basic technical requirements for each and every Alaṁkāra, we find that many masterely delineated verses of Bhavabhūti have struck the poetic sensitivity of the commentators in so many different ways that they observe various Alaṁkāras in a single instance, sometimes of completely different nature. Unfortunately not all commentators have displayed the keenness that is displayed by Śeṣarāja Śarmā who has noted the most striking Alaṁkāra in each and every verse of the *Uttararāmacarita*. Commentators Nārāyaṇa and Vīrarāghava have forwarded very interesting arguments on the Alaṁkāraśāstra also.

Semantic Aspects in the Commentaries :

The two-fold interpretation of Semantic aspects viz. the interpretation of the 'Vācya' and 'Vyaṅgya' of Bhavabhūti's drama as understood and explained by the commentators, make an interesting study. The Dhvani is employed by Bhavabhūti and the commentator's exposition of these hidden meanings is found to be of immense help. In fact, the exposition of suggested meanings and an explanation of the expressed words are found to be too closely related to be dealt separately. The commentators, in the process of explaining a 'Vācya' expression seen through a multitude of suggestions in an effort to find the real purport of each expression and the suggested meanings lend entirely new dimensions to the 'Vācya' words. With the felicity of their imagination, these commentators make a happier and wiser person of any reader. Ghanaśyāma appears to have used the word

Dhvani in the widest possible sense of the term. A critical examination of the instances reveal that he may be referring to the idea of a pun or alliteration by the term '*iti dhvaniḥ.*'

Interpretation :

Complete exposition of a verse or a prose sentence is termed as interpretation. Exposition includes both, as stated above, the interpretation of 'Vācya' expression as well as, exposing the hidden suggestions which obviously are not spoken in so many words. This exposition or interpretation is considered as the other aspect of Dhvani.

There are numerous instances of masterly performance of interpretations in the commentaries. Vīrarāghava's and Nārāyaṇa's commentaries, in particular abound in such instances whereby the fine analysis, even on a rather simple verse or sentence the commentator makes one believe that the simplicity in the works of great masters of literary art like Bhavabhūti, is after all, so deceptive. Often times the commentator simply appears to loosen himself to be identified with the mood and spirit of the writer trying to elicit the exact intention of the writer. It also speaks highly of the resourcefulness of the commentators themselves who have revealed the capacity of writing almost an essay on a simple verse or a phrase.

The study has dealt in great detail the interpretations forwarded by the commentators on Bhavabhūti's famous verses like—

'*patanaviralaiḥ prāntonmīlanmanoharakuntalaiḥ*' (I.20)

'*janakānām raghūṇām ca sambandhaḥ kasya na priyaḥ*' (I.11)

'*antaḥkaraṇatatvasya dampatyoḥ snehasaṃśrayāt*' (III.17)

'*aniyataruditasmitam virājatkatipayakomaladanta-*
kuḍmalāgram' (IV.4)

Certain verses, like the 'Prarocanā' verse '*yam brahmāṇamiyam devī*' (I.2), are interpreted differently by each one of the commentator, make very interesting reading. The instance of the singel verse '*etasmin madakalamallikākṣa* (I.31), where Bhavabhūti's imagination is at its peak, that of Vīrarāghava, follows closely, as if to catch the flight of Bhavabhūti's imagination. He forwards various interpretations, each one more charming than the other. Ghanaśyāma's interpretation and remarks on the famous verse '*asminneva latāgṛhe praṇāmāñjaliḥ*' (III.37) reveal that the commentators never hesitated to point out a mistake or a flaw on the part of the dramatist. His views regarding lack of propriety exhibited by the dramatist speaks very high of the independence of thought and approach. There are instances like the verse '*advaitam sukhaduḥkhayoranugatam*' (I.39) where the interpretations vary due to the variations in the text followed by the commentators. The foregoing analysis amply dispel the notion that the commentaries are merely a word to word paraphrasing of the text.

Dramaturgic aspects in the Commentaries :

Uttararāmacarita being a drama, consideration of the various dramaturgic elements, technical or non-technical, have been dealt with all seriousness by the commentators. All commentators have forwarded definition of a Nāṭaka and their opinion as to how far Bhavabhūti, has adhered to the rules given by traditional dramaturgical works. Like many other aspects of the *Uttararāmacarita*, the Nāndī is also a controversial one. There is difference of opinion regarding where and by whom the Nāndī is sung, as well as the form of this Nāndī verse. Again, the interpretation of the Nāndī verse, in the background of its technical requirements, is not only varied but very interesting. So also the arguments whether the Nāndī is a Pūrvaraṅga Nāndī or Sthāpanā Nāndī. Like the Nāndī, lengthy discussions on the Prastāvanā, Prarocanā, Viṣkambhaka, Cūlikā are also found. Only three commentators Vīrarāghava, Lakṣmaṇa Sūri and Kumāra Tātārya have pointed out and analysed the Sandhis and their Sandhyaṅgas. Only one commentator Kumāra Tātārya has made an attempt to locate and explain Nāṭakalakṣaṇas and Nāṭyālaṁkāras. Like the Nāndī verse, the Bharatavākya of *Uttararāmacarita* is also not according to rules and once again the commentators try their abilities in explaining and interpreting it. As a result of clever use of phrases with two meanings, a direct one and an indirect one, Bhavabhūti is found to achieve his purpose of presenting a 'Praśasti' to serve as the 'Bharatavākya' in the drama, as well as a clever medium of advertisement for his work. The commentators are found to forward intelligent convincing ways of explaining the double purpose of the verse. Their detailed analysis clearly reveals that the commentators are true connoisseurs and a fine work of art like this masterpiece of Bhavabhūti cannot but hold their keen interest till the last utterance of the poet.

Textual criticism in the Commentaries

The last part of the study is an examination of the commentator's contribution in an effort to recover the authentic text intended by Bhavabhūti in his *Uttararāmacarita.* Since the study is based solely on the text evidence contained in the commentaries of the drama, which forms only a fragment of valuable and substantial evidence, it is inadequate to construct the full text of the drama, by itself. Nevertheless, these commentators' textual evidence, being authentic and original are of immense significance for the reconstruction of the text of the *Uttararāmacarita*, which is yet to be attempted.

A total of twenty commentaries and text editions are included for a comparative study, wherein the alternative 'Pāṭhas' noted, and alternative ones suggested by the commentators are listed. Īśvaracandra Vidyāsāgara has rendered a valuable contribution by noting the text variations from four earlier Mss. of the drama which he consulted at the time of preparing his own edition. The contribution of earlier commentators like Nārāyaṇa, Ghanaśyāma and Vīrarāghava though valuable, is sparse and incomplete since the 'Pāṭha' is available only if they choose to explain or discuss it. The commentaries of Premacandra, Īśvaracandra, Jīvānanda, Lakṣmaṇa Sūrī and Kumāra Tātārya, being recent in age as well as being published, are complete.

The texts are broadly divided into two groups viz. the Southern group consisting of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa, Ghanaśyāma, Vīrarāghava, Lakṣmaṇa Śūrī and Kumāra Tātārya, all hailing from the South. The other group can be called the Northern group led by the Varanasi Manuscript, followed by Raghūttama Śiromaṇi, Premacandra Tarkavāgīśa, Īśvaracandra Vidyāsāgara, Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara and B. S. Ghate.

A cursery glance at the tabulation of 'Pāṭhabhedas' shows that almost the entire text of the drama offers variations. The prose sentences, both small and lengthy compounded ones suffer heavily from lack of a definite text. The verses, as compared are found to be less tempered with, as a result, there are quite a number of verses where the commentators and edited texts unanimously agree.

The differences in the texts are of various types. The text being a drama, seems to have what is technically termed as 'recensions'. Prominent differences are—(*i*) the total number of verses, (*ii*) the sequence of verses, (*iii*) order of speech of the prose sentences, (*iv*) clubbing of two sentences spoken by two characters as a single sentence, (*v*) splitting of a sentence spoken by one character as that of two characters and (*vi*) total omission of sentences. The text shows numerous other types of differences which are minor and occur less frequently.

Some prominent causes of textual variations in a text like confusion of letters, change of letters, phonetic confusions, transposition of words or parts of a word in a sentence, change in vowels, change in case of terminations, variation in splitting of compounds are all discussed with illustrations. There are instances which are probably actor's interpolations and also cases where the commentaries offer suggestions.

Speaking of the Mss. of the *Mālatī Mādhava*, R. G. Bhandarkar remarked, " Looking to the fact that the groups give readings which are intelligible enough and often equally good. Though a shade of difference can be discovered, which renders one preferable to the other, the conviction traced itself upon me that these changes were made by the poet himself at different times and some Mss. have preserved the earlier forms and others the later " (*Malatī-Mādhava*, Bombay, 1905,Preface, p. vi). A critical study of the 'Pāṭhabhedas' in the *Uttararāmacarita*', convinces one that the remarks are equally true in case of *Uttararāmacarita* also.

Evaluation of Commentators as Literary Critics :

This comparative and critical analysis of the various commentaries indicate in ample measure their utility, importance and worth.

Some of these commentaries are ideal representatives of the great tradition of commentary literature whose main objective is to increase understanding and appreciation of a significant work. Vīrarāghava's commentary Bhāvatalasparśinī is the best of all the commentaries indicated in the study, followed by Nārāyaṇa's *Bhāvārthadīpikā*, Ghanaśyāma's *Sañjīvana* and Kumāra Tātārya's *Kalā*. Other commentaries, though not offering very significant help, yet each of them have their own merit.

Literary criticism, as understood in the Western literature, in both its aspects, viz. the theoretical as well as practical or applied criticism is known to have an ancient and long tradition. Sanskrit literature too has an equally ancient and mighty tradition on the theory or philosophy of criticism where great thinkers propounded theories on what they considered as the essential elements in a poetic work. But it has no tradition of practical criticism to match. However, these commentaries are a testimony to the fact that critical activity was not totally absent from the literary scene. A careful examination of these commentators endowed with scholarly mind and high intellectual attainments, capable of independent thinking and at the same time connoisseurs true to the word, reveal that the commentators indeed form the very vital link between the writers of works on ' criticism ' on the one hand and the creative writer, on the other. For, they have tried to analyse and understand *Uttararāmacarita* in the light of doctrines and views of the writers on dramaturgy and poetics and demonstrated the actual application of the theory by the writer Bhavabhūti. Also, in the process, given an opinion of how well it is achieved. Hence, it can be asserted without hesitation that the commentators on classical works in Sanskrit in general and Vīrarāghava, Ghanaśyāma, Nārāyaṇa and other commentators in the case of the *Uttararāmacarita* have served almost the same purpose of a practical critic, as the term is understood in Western literature.

RĀMAPĀṆIVĀDA, — A STUDY OF HIS WORKS IN SANSKRIT AND PRAKRIT*

SWARNALATHA G. PAI

The Life of Rāmapāṇivāda :

Ancient Kerala's contribution to Sanskrit learning is considerable. The Oriental literature of Kerala which developed every branch of learning has left back a rich inheritance comprising of the works of such famous authors like Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, Sakthibhadra, Lilasuka, Kulashekhara, Rāmapāṇivāda and others who occupy an unrivalled position in the history of Sanskrit literature. Rāmapāṇivāda, a prolific writer who wrote works on the different branches of literature such as Mahākāvya, Nāṭaka, Campū, Minor play called Vīthī etc. is a name to be reckoned with and is one of the foremost writers of Kerala. Like almost all the ancient Indian writers he has not left behind any information about his personal history. What we can gather about his life is from the stray references in his own works and references to him by other writers who came after him. He belonged to a Nambiar family, sub-community among the Nairs of Kerala whose profession was to beat a drum known as Pāṇivādya or Mighavu in Malayalam. He was a native of a village called Mangalagrāma. He was the nephew of Rāghavan Nambiar. The name of the house to which he belonged is said to be Kalakattu house. His father was a Namboodiri brahmin who was a priest in the temple of Killikurisi Mangala (Mangala grāma) which was consecrated to Śiva. Rāmapāṇivāda refers to his teacher in glowing terms in his various works. His. teacher, Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, was a learned Namboodiri Brahmin of Thrikkarimon Illam, the Namboodiris of which were hereditory Tantrins in the famous temple at Killikurisi Mangalam. But regarding the details of his childhood and education we are in the dark. At the same time he refers to half a dazon patrons under whose sunshine he basked and produced his excellent works one by one. He mentions a King Vīrarāya of Prakāsha Rājya known as Vettathu Nadu in Malayalam. Paliyat Accan, a minister of the Raja of Cochin, who lived at Jayanta Mangalam also known as Chennanmangalam was another patron of Rāmapāṇivāda. He mentions King Devanārāyaṇa of Ambalapuzha in his chief work *Rāghavīyam.* He also mentions King Mārtaṇḍavarmā of Travancore. He mentions one Ārya Śrīkaṇṭha, the chief of Mukundapuram in one of his *Śatakas.* Rajavarma in his *Keralīya Samskrita Sāhitya Caritram* Vol. IV page 16, says that Rāmapāṇivāda died of old age and that it was probable that he was suffering from some incurable disease as can be inferred from his prayers to of the God he praised in his *Śataka.*

---

*Submitted to the University of Bombay in 1975.

The Date of Rāmapāṇivāda :

Rāmapāṇivāda is one among the few Sanskrit poets whose dates have been determined with fair accuracy on account of the internal evidence. In the case of Rāmapāṇivāda the internal evidence consists of a passage in his " *Sītārāghavam* " which mentions King Mārtaṇḍavarmā, his patron and states that the play was staged on the occasion of a Murajapam, which took place in the year 1756 A.D. From this it is clear that he lived in the middle of 18th century of the Christian era.

Rāmapāṇivāda and Kuncan Nambiar :

There is a controversy among the lovers of Sanskrit literature in Kerala with regard to the identity of Rāmapāṇivāda and Kuncan Nambiar, a well known Malayalam poet. The most prominent among those who supported the identity were Ullur Parameswara Iyer and L.A. Ravivarma and among those who denied it were Dr. Kunjan Raja and Vadakkumkur Rajaraja Varma. But on the strength of the arguments advanced on both the sides and also from the study of their works it will not be far in the wrong if we conclude that Rāmapāṇivāda and Kuncan Nambiar are two different persons altogether.

The Works of Rāmapāṇivāda :

Rāmapāṇivāda was a Polymath like Kṣemendra of Kashmir and has tried his hand at various types of literary compositions. The number of original compositions is fourteen and besides these he has written commentaries on his own Mahākāvyas and some other Kāvyas. His works known at present are the following :—

Type of Work	*Name of the work*
Stotras	1. *Ambaranadīśastava*
	2. *Sūryāṣṭaka*
	3. *Mukundaśataka*
Mahākāvya	4. *Viṣṇuvilāsa*
	5. *Rāghavīyam*
Vithī	6. *Candrikā*
	7. *Līlāvatī*
Prahasana	8. *Madanaketucaritam*
Nāṭaka	9. *Sītārāghavam*
Campū	10. *Bhāgavatacampū*
Commentaries	11. *Vilāsinī*
	12. *Vivaraṇa*
	13. *Prākṛtasūtravṛtti*
	14. *Viṣṇupriyā*
	15. *Bālapāṭhya*
On metres	16. *Vṛttavārtikā*
	17. *Rāsakrīḍā*
Prakrit Poems	18. *Kamsavaho*
	19. *Uṣāniruddha*

Besides these three more works are also attributed to him. Because of lack of evidence I consider them to be of doubtful authorship. They are the following :—

Of doubtful authorship :

Stotras	1. *Mukundaśataka II*
	2. *Śivaśataka*
Work on Musics	3. *Tālaprastāra*

The Chronological Order of the Works of Rāmapāṇivāda :

In the absence of definite information about the dates of compositions of the various works of Rāmapāṇivāda either from his own works or from references to them in the works of others we have to depend upon other evidences such as the style and the nature of the works to determine the probable chronological order of this author's works. On this basis a probable chronological order is attempted and the works are assigned to three periods.

A. Period of apprenticeship :

1. *Commentary on Kṛṣṇavilāsa*
2. *Commentary on Dhātukāvya*
3. *Commentary on Prākṛta-Prakāśa*
4. *Vṛttavārtikā*
5. *Rāsakrīḍā*
6. *Kamsavaho*
7. *Uṣāniruddha*
8. *Candrikāvīthī*

B. Period of Maturity :

9. *Viṣṇuvilāsa*
10. *Commentary on Viṣṇuvilāsa*
11. *Ambaranadīśastavam*
12. *Līlāvatīvīthī*
13. *Madanaketucaritam*
14. *Rāghavīyam*
15. *Commentary on Rāghavīyam*
16. *Sītārāghavam*
17. *Sūryāṣṭaka*

C. Old Age :

18. *Mukundaśataka*
19. *Bhāgavatacampū*

Doubtful authorship :

1. *Mukundaśataka II*
2. *Śivaśataka*
3. *Tālaprastāra*

1. *Vilāsinī* : This is a commentary on *Kṛṣṇavilāsa* of Sukumāra. This commentary is unfortunately incomplete and is available only upto the verse 50 of the XIth Canto.

2. *Vivaraṇa* : This is a commentary on *Dhātukāvya* of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa. Rāmapāṇivāda however has not commented upon the whole of this poem. The commentary is not elaborate.

3. *Prākṛtasūtravṛtti* : This is a commentary on the *Prākṛta-Prakāśa* of Vararuci. Rāmapāṇivāda after mastering the rules for conversion of Sanskrit into Prakrit wrote the commentary also. The rules are in the form of sūtras like those of Pāṇini. And our author explains them in Sanskrit and gives illustrations. All the sūtras are explained in this manner. The chapters dealing with Paiśācī and Māgadhī dialects of the Prakrit are ommitted by our author.

4. *Vṛttavārtikā* : This is a treatise dealing with metres. Rāmapāṇivāda deals only with the classical metres in their three divisions, the Samavṛtta ardhasamavṛtta and the Viṣamavṛtta. For illustrating the metres he has depended upon the works of other authors.

5. *Rāsakrīḍā* : This is a work belonging to the type called Kāvyaśāstra. This poem describing the Rāsalīlā of Kṛṣṇa illustrates the different permutations of the short and long syllables in the Anuṣṭubh metre. There are 256 possible permutations of the eight letters in a quarter of the stanza formed with Guru and Laghu. Thus there are 256 verses given as illustrations and divided into four cantos. The first verse contains all Gurus in all the four quarters and the last verse has all the four quarters containing all Laghus. There are no poetic embellishments or expression of high poetic thoughts. The source of this poem is in the tenth skanda of *Srīmad Bhāgavatam*. There are no noteworthy changes except for the introduction of Rādhā.

6. *Kamsavaho* : This Prakrit poem of Rāmapāṇivāda deals with the popular theme, the slaying of Kamsa by Kṛṣṇa. It has four cantos and contains 233 verses. He says that its study would introduce one into the field of Prakrit literature. The theme of this poem borrowed from the *Bhāgavata purāṇa* though slender by itself has been elaborated by the poet by introducing descriptive passages in the classical style. Though fond of alliteration our poet is free from exhibitions of bad taste peculiar to Bhāravi and Māgha. His ability in delineating the tender sentiment is marked by elegant expression. Having himself written a work on metrics, Rāmapāṇivāda shows himself to be an expert in handling a variety of metres in this poem. In the use of Alaṁkāra's too, to embellish his poem, he does not lag behind.

7. *Uṣānirudha* : This Prakrit poem too has four cantos. For the subject matter of this small poem, the author has entirely drawn upon the story of Uṣā and Anirudha described in chapters sixty-two and Sixtythree of the tenth skanda of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. However he has introduced some descriptions of his own in order to enhance the poetic beauty of the poem. There is grace and grandeur in the admirable blend of philosophy and erotics. It is like a wholesome mixture of wine and ginger. The love scenes are most delicately handled by the poet.

8. *Candrikā Vīthī* : This Vīthi is named after the heroine of the play. The plot is not drawn from history, but merely an invented one. This being one of his early works, the poet seems to have attempted to compose verses in as many metres as possible. There pervades a sensuousness of description and a mellifluous flow of words.

9. *Viṣṇuvilāsa* : This is a Mahākāvya in eight cantos. It deals with the story of Viṣṇu's first nine incarnations. The incarnation of Buddha is substituted by Balarāma. The poet has drawn the material for his Kāvya from *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. He has given the subject matter a poetic garb without effecting any appreciable changes. The poet has given free reins to his imagination, while describing the Avatāras of Matsya, Kūrma, Varāha, Nṛsimha, Vāmana and Bhārgava Rāma. There are many descriptive passages and suggestive expressions. In using the different metres he has taken care to see that elegance is not sacrificed.

10. *Viṣṇupriyā* : This is Rāmapāṇivāda's own commentary on *Viṣṇuvilāsa*. This commentary is available only upto the end of sixth canto.

11. *Ambaranadīśastavam* : This is a poem in 113 verses in praise of Lord Kṛṣṇa, the presiding deity of Ambalapuzha. This is considered as the best among the author's religious lyrics. It exhibits the poet's mastery over Sanskrit language. Being a composition belonging to his period of youth, manner predominates over matter.

12. *Līlāvatī* : This Vīthī is also named after the heroine of the play. The main element in this drama being the love affair between the King Vīrapāla and Līlāvathi, the sentiment of love is elaborately delineated.

13. *Madanacetucarita* : This is a play belonging to the type called Prahasana. Its plot is the author's own invention. This is a satire directed against the Buddhist monks who lead profligate lives. Compared with other Prahasanas this is a well written play and its literary style is highly poetic abounding in descriptions and lyrical passages of beauty. In the passages depicting the erotic sentiments the style is elegant and the expressions are lucid.

14. *Rāghavīyam* : This is a Māhâkāvya dealing with the story of *Rāmāyana*. He has followed Vālmiki's *Rāmāyṇa* without deviating even a little. This Mahākāvya is composed in conformity with the definition of Mahākāvya. Regarding the language and style it is free from artificial exercises in style. The poet intended his work to be a Kāvya text for students and as such there are turns in expressions illustrating grammatical and other peculiarities. And throughout the poet has adhered to simple language and lucid expression. This can be said to be the finest performance of Rāmapāṇivāda both in point of maturity of thought and felicity of language.

15. *Bālapāṭhya* : This is a commentary on *Rāghavīyam*. This is available only in manuscript form and it begins with the XIth canto.

16. *Sītārāghavam* : In this graceful play the author has succeeded in blending together the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa* forming the main plot and the story of Māyāvasu's revenge, the author's own creation, forming the subplot. Both plots are given equal importance. The author has succeeded in producing a play in which the interest does not flag from beginning to end. All the scenes have remarkble appeal to the imagination of the audience by virtue of their strikingness and it is there that the charm of the play lies.

17. *Sūryāṣṭaka* : This is a small hymn (nine verses) of praise to the sun-god. The poet states in the concluding stanza that it is a poem of double entendre.

18. *Mukundaśataka* : This is a religious lyric containing 107 verses praising the deity Mukunda of Mukundapura. The poem extols the achievements of the Lord Viṣṇu in the Kṛṣṇāvatāra. An autobiographical hint that we gather from this poem is that the poet was suffering from painful disease; for the poet now and then prays for deliverance from this disease. Throughout the hymn there rings a note of resignation and fervant devotion to the Lord.

19. *Bhāgavatacampū* : This Campū-Kāvya has for its source *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, daśamaskanda. The poet has not effected any change except introducing the name, Rādhā, for the specially favoured Gopī, as described in the Rāsakrīḍā portion of the original. Being a product of mature years, the author's descriptive powers are well brought out. His pretty fancy adds charm to his picturesque images. His expression too is exquisitely refined. It is an admirable piece of poetic art. Rāmapāṇivāda who possesses a keen ear for music is found taking care in the selection of words for describing particular events and sentiments.

Rāmapāṇivāda as a Poet :

Rāmapāṇivāda was the most gifted Sanskrit writer of his day. The only other writer of Kerala with whom he may be compared is Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa of Melputtur who preceded him by a century and a half. Both avoided what is light and vulgar in real life and chose themes from the Epics and Purāṇas, which are capable of inspiring us with high thoughts. The plots are mainly derived from the *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*. By selecting these themes the poet describes vividly how great men in ancient times have lived and behaved. The poet creates an ideal world, a world better than our real world, which is full of error, ignorance and strife. By doing so the poet soothes the cares and lifts the thoughts of men. It was Keats who said in "Sleep and Poetry," 'Poetry should soothe the cares and lift the thoughts of men.' It is this same aim that is expressed by our poet in the concluding lines of the '*Rāghavīyam.*'

Karṇānandam Kaluṣaśamanam Kāmadam Vāmadeva-
Prīterekam Karaṇamucitam Kāraṇam Sampadām ca /

Dīrghāyuṣyam Kimiha Bahunā Sarvadā Sarvadam Vaḥ
Śreyo deyādanupamamidam Rāghavīyam Caritram // XX-92.

Rāmapāṇivāda has kept up the tradition of the sustained and elevated composition known as the Mahākāvya in his *Rāghavīyam*. All the requirements prescribed by the rhetoricians are found in this poem. It is to be said to the credit of Rāmapāṇivāda that he has not allowed the narrative to loose interest by freely indulging in luxurious descriptions. Because Rāmapāṇivāda had no pedantic aim, but only the pious wish of '*Kaluṣaśamanam*' and *vāmadevaprīti* his *Rāghavīyam* is refreshingly free from any extravagance of diction unsuitable to emotion. There is simplicity and directness in the treatment of the theme by our author.

The various descriptions of nature like descriptions of mountains, seasons etc. are in highly elevated style. The description of Citrakūṭa mountain (VI 1-23) that of Daṇḍaka forest (VII·19-28) and the description of the city of Laṅkā (XII 48-58) are not only grandiose in style but are artificial in content. The realistic touch that we meet with in Vālmikī is absent here.

It is a general characteristic of nature descriptions of Sanskrit poets that dumb nature is fancied to possess feelings and emotions like human beings. Rāmapāṇivāda describes earth as a lady sporting amidst lovers :

Prasphuṭatkuṭajapuṣpahāsinī Korakāvṛtakadambakaṇṭakā
Proṣitānumiliteṣu teṣu bhūrullalāsa ramaṇeṣvivāṅganā ||

Rāgha. XI·3

Rāmapāṇivāda's delineations of the sentiment of love are, not extravagant. He is better at home in the depiction of Vipralambha Śṛṅgāra than Sambhoga Śṛṅgāra. The depiction of the scene of lamentations of the Gopīs at the disappearance of Kṛṣṇa (*Bhāgavatacampū IV* 76-101) is poignantly pathetic and is characterised by a tenderness of expression. The tone of emotion is earnest. It seems the feelings and thoughts arise in the poet's mind and he expresses what he thinks and feels.

The poet has depicted the comic scene of women hastening to meet Kṛṣṇa in the forest (*Bhāgavatacampū* IV 36-41).

In the delineation of pathos-Karuṇarasa- the poet shows talent. The account of Rāma's sufferings in the 10th canto and later in the 11th canto shows that the poet can handle pathos better than the sentiment of love. He must have himself experienced the poignant grief in order to describe Rāma's misery.

The other sentiments too, namely the heroic, the terrific and the revolting have been handled by the poet effectively as the occasions arose for a delineation of the same. Battle scenes in *Rāghavīya*, *Viṣṇuvilāsa* and *Sītārāghava* have been fully utilised by our poet for delineating the heroic (Vīra) sentiment. *Rāghavīyam*, VIII 62-74, X 69-83, XVII 35-77, XVIII 17-53, *Viṣṇuvilāsa* III 54-69, VI 47-60, VIII 50-58. *Sītārāghava* Act VI and VII interlude, description of the battlefield strewn with dead bodies and the goblins gloating over the prospect of a feast is an instance of Bībhatsa Rasa e.g. *Sītārāghava* Act VII interlude.

In the exployment of Alaṁkāras, Rāmapāṇivāda excells in the use of Rūpaka, Utprekṣā and Upamā. His descriptions of natural phenomena abound in Rūpaka and Utprekṣā. He has made use of as many Ārthālaṁkāras as possible in his works. He is an adept in the use of the Śabdālaṁkāra, Anuprāsa. The following verse has the peculiarity of the sound echoing the sense.

Jhalajjhalitanūpuram calitakiṅkiṇīkaṅkaṇam
Cchaṭākalakalonmilanmuralīkaravaghoṣitam |
Arālaghanakuntalīśithilakekipicchāñcalam
Vyarājadahimastakemurajitaḥ śiśostāṇḍavam ||

Rāgh. VII 18

As a Keralite Rāmapāṇivāda was fond of the " Tullal " mode of recitation and he has included some verses in this work to illustrate the " Tullal " recitation. The following is a part of one of such passages :

Hāsaśrījitakairavkuṇḍam
Rāsakrīḍānalolamamaṇḍam
Rasikaśiromaṇimagamakandam
Ramitabhīranatāṅgivṛndam
Vṛndāvanabhuvi viharantam paśu
Vṛndāvanaparamaniśam tam divi
Vṛndārakakulamakhilamavandata
Nandatanūjam Navanānandam ||

Bhāgavatacampū Page 67

There are no obscure passages in Rāmapāṇivāda's works even though there are long compounds. So he is to be admired for not sacrificing Arthavyakti for exhibiting his pendantry. The prominent characteristic that we note in his works is that there are many single verses that can stand by themselves presenting each a single well-knit unit as if it were a little picture in itself. Most of the verses in the *Bhāgavata campa* are of this kind.

Sphuranmakarakuṇḍalam Maṇikirīṭabhārojjvalam
Vilolavanamālikamilitaharadorantaram |
Caturbhujamidam gadākamalaśankhacakrāṇkitam
Vapurdadhatamātmajam jagati ko' smadanyo' dhyagāt ||

Bhāgavatacampū I 46

A learned and a poet of remarkable acquirements that he was, Rāmapāṇivāda has left us poems which furnish easy and pleasant reading, and it will be only just to allow him a rank next to the first rate poets like Vālmīki and Kālidāsa.

Rāmapāṇivāda as a Dramatist:

A Sanskrit drama is a Kāvya ; it is a Kāvya that is to be seen, a Dṛśya kāvya. And the soul of a Kāvya is Rasa. So the plot as well as characterisation has become secondary in a Sanskrit drama. It is with such principles before him that Rāmapāṇivāda proceeded with his dramas.

Rāmapāṇivāda's first dramatic composition is *Candrikāvīthī*. He has conceived a theme parallel to that of *Vikramorvaśīyam*. The plot is slight neither the hero nor the heroine has anything in them to make an impression upon the audience. Delineation of sentiment is also unimpressive. The play suffers for want of originality and invention. The next play *Līlāvathīvīthī* resembles *Mālavikāgnimitra* of Kālidāsa. This play shows a marked improvement in the poet's conception of the plot and his ability in handling it. His art of dramatisation as well as delineation of sentiment has considerably improved.

The third play of Rāmapāṇivāda is a Prahasana, *Madanacetucarita*, the comedy of manners and here too it was a remarkable success. In the case of this play, *Madanacetucarita* he had before him, the *Bhagavadajjukīya* of Bodhāyana. In the farce of this kind the plot is not important, the dramatist uses it only as a thread to hand a number of diverting incidents in which human weaknesses are depicted. The blending of the love-story of the hero with the story of the reformation of the Buddhist monks reveals the deftness of a clever artist. The dramatist had tried to inculcate certain ethical standards in the readers (audience) and succeeded.

The *Sītārāghava*, being a product of his mature years is a play which displays a remarkable novelty of conception and success in execution. All the main scenes and interludes are characterised by strikingness that fascinate the audience. The narrative of the *Rāmāyaṇa* forms only a link connecting the various scenes. The progress in the story is made known only through dialogues narrating the main events.

Dialogues in Rāmapāṇivāda's plays are noteworthy for their simple diction and freedom from long compounds which would have rendered them undramatic. As regards the Prakrit employed in these plays it is to be remembered that it is not the spoken language. It is only a literary language obtained by converting Sanskrit to Prakrit by using Vararuci's rules of conversion.

Rāmapāṇivāda as a Commentator :

Though Rāmapāṇivāda was a good poet and a good dramatist, he was not a good commentator. He had five commentaries to his credit, two on his own Mahākāvyas and three on the works of others. His commentaries are very simple. He gives word by word meaning and mentions the Alaṁkāras in the verses. He also points out the grammatical peculiarities such as the change of Pada. But he does not discuss any topic raising Pūrvapakṣa and answer it as some other commentators do. So his commentaries are not exhaustive. He himself confesses that his commentary is a 'Saṁkṣepā' in a statement " *Vyākhyā tasyā tu pāṇivādakalitā Saṁkṣeparūpaiva yā* " found at the close of the first canto of commentary on *Dhātukāvya*.

Rāmapāṇivāda as a Scholar :

A Scholar is distinguished for his ideas which possess that quality called sublimity and his expression is equally grand. Sublimity is said to be the greatest of all literary virtues. When a work in literature is capable of carrying the reader to new heights of emotional experience, it is said to be sublime. Vedānta Philosophy is the branch of literature which contains the sublimest of ideas. There are many references to Vedānta philosophy in Rāmapāṇivāda's works—*Viṣṇuvilāsa* III 30, 31, IV 59-64. *Ambaranadīṣastava* 50, 98, *Uṣāniruddham* II 64-65. He also refers to Sāmkhya philosophy in his *Uṣāniruddham* II 66. He alludes to

Māyāvāda too in *Uṣāniruddham* II-66. His knowledge of the *Upaniṣads* is revealed in his *Uṣāniruddham* III-27. Rāmapāṇivāda had mastered not only Sanskrit grammar but Prakrit grammar also which was essential for a dramatist. He was equally learned in the science of poetics and prosody. He has used a large variety of metres. His use of figures of speech, figures of sense as well as sound merits praise. He shows sense enough not to indulge in verbal excesses like those of later day poets.

He was well versed in the *Purāṇas, Bhāgavata Purāṇa* in particular. He must have closely studied the *Rāmāyaṇa* of Vālmīki and *Mahābhārata*. He was also conversant with the lexicons such as *Amarakośa, Medinīkośa* and *Vaijayantīkośa* etc. for he refers to these while explaining his commentaries.

Rāmapāṇivāda's Style :

Daṇḍin distinguished two styles of writing—the Vaidarbhī and the Gauḍī. Vāmana, who came later added a third, the Pāñcālī. The ten characteristics of Vaidarbhī Rītī are; Śleṣa, Prasāda, Samatā, Mādhuryam, Sukumāratā, Arthavyakti, Udāratvam, Ojas, Kānti and Samādhi. Rāmapāṇivāda's style may be said to possess more or less of these characteristics of Vaidarbhī Rītī which was the favourite style of Kālidāsa also.

Rāmapāṇivāda's Personality :

A close study of his works gives one a number of glimpses into his personality.

He appears to have been an extremely modest man. He is never seen to boast about his learning as some other poets did. He had great respect for his preceptor, Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa whom he mentions with reverence in almost all his works.

He must have been a lover of dance and music. His love of music is reflected in the mellifluous lines of his verses. He describes the Rāsakrīḍā in three different works. It must have been his love of dance, particularly of the Lord in the company of Gopīs that made him repeat the description.

Uninfluenced by Western education of its progressive views Rāmapāṇivāda remained a staunch believer in the traditional tenets of Hindusim. He began his career as a poet. In his earlier Kāvyas the poet praises God Viṣṇu, his favourite deity. Later on, in his three devotional hymns he very often refers to the tenets of Vedānta. Now the poet has turned Philosopher. His philosophy is not merely theoretical one, but is the outcome of his firm conviction of the existence of the Supreme Being. At last the philosopher has changed into an ardent devotee. His sincere devotion brings forth a few verses from the very bottom of his heart in his last and incomplete work, *Bhāgavata Campū* VII 102-104. Whatever he thought or said or did was in a spirit of dedication to God. He says so in *Mukundaśataka* verse 93. These in nutshell reveal his philosophy of life—that sincere devotion is the easiest means to salvation.

THE ELEMENTS OF POETRY IN THE YOGAVĀSIṢṬHA (BOOKS I AND II)*

M. B. Wani

The *Yogavāsiṣṭha* (YV) is a voluminous philosophical work (containing 32,000 verses) in the form of popular lectures and is variously known as Yogavāsiṣṭha, Mahārāmāyaṇa, Ārṣarāmāyaṇa and Vāsiṣṭharāmāyaṇa. The work is in the form of a conversation between Vasiṣṭha and Rāma and its main contents form the philosophical instruction given by the former to the latter, thus resembling the *Bhagavadgītā* in this outer form.

Philosophically, the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* is a synthesis of different systems like Vedānta, Buddhism, Trika, Śaivism, Vaiṣṇavism etc. and is generally considered to be a work on Advaita Vedānta. Dr. T. G. Mainkar has fixed its date to be around 1200 A.D.. It declares Jñāna to be the sole means to realise Mokṣa, but does not preclude action in the liberated state.

What is striking about this work in comparison to other well-known works on philosophy is that it is written in a highly ornate poetical style. The author (whose identity can only vaguely be fixed as some learned disciple of an ascetic Brahmānanda by name ; though the work is traditionally attributed to Vālmiki) claims that :

Śāstram subodhamevaidaṁ sālaṁkāravibhūṣitam |
Kāvyaṁ rasamayaṁ cāru dṛṣṭāntaiḥ pratipāditam ||

YV II. 18.33.

The present study of the *Yogavāsiṣṭha* has been inspired by its poetic quality and attempts to investigate the claim of the author that it is *Kāvyaṁ rasamayaṁ cāru*, by applying to it the standard theories of Alaṁkāras, Rasa etc. as enunciated by the well-known Master of Rhetorics, Mammaṭa, the author of

---

*Submitted to the University of Bombay in 1973.

Kāvyaprakāśa. The limited corpus of the first two books viz. (1) The Vairāgyaprakaraṇa and (2) The Mumukṣuprakaraṇa, was considered sufficient for the purpose of testing the variety of the poet's claim, taking into account the profusion of poetic elements in its lines as already pointed out by Dr. Dasgupta.

Figures of Sense (*Arthālaṁkāras*) :

A large variety of Arthālaṁkāras as many as 28 are found used by the poet in the present corpus. They are : Atiśayokti, Anumāna, Anyonya, Aprastutapraśaṁsā, Arthāntaranyāsa, Arthāpatti, Utprekṣā, Upamā, Ekāvali, Kāvyaliṅga, Tulyayogitā, Dīpaka, Dṛṣṭānta, Nidarśanā, Parikara, Parisaṁkhyā, Prativastūpamā, Rūpaka, Virodha, Viśeṣokti, Viṣama, Vyatireka, Sama, Samāsokti, Sahokti, Svabhāvokti, Saṁkara and Saṁsṛṣṭi. Upamā and Rūpaka are the forte of the poet and their number is overwhelmingly large. The poet's skill in developing complex Metaphors is uncommon and reveals his power of minute observation of the world around. The Upamānas used by him in developing Upamās and Rūpakas reveal his rich imagination and can form subjects of independent treatises. A few illustrations of these two prominent figures of sense are given below in order to give an idea of the poet's exuberant imagination.

UPAMĀ

1. *hṛtkuśeśayakoṣeṣu yeṣām śamakuśeśayam |*
satām vikasitam te hi dvihṛtpadmāḥ samā hareḥ ||
II.13·55

Translation—The good people in the interiors of the lotuses of whose hearts there blooms the lotus in the form of tranquillity, are like Lord Viṣṇu possessed of two heart-lotuses (one in the form of his actual heart and another as a seat of Lord Brahmā).

This is an instance of Vākyagā Ārthi Pūrṇā Upamā.

Upameya—Santaḥ ; Upamāna—Hariḥ ;

Sādharmya—Dvihṛtpadmatva ; Vādi—Samāḥ.

2. *vinayabhūṣitam āryajanāspadam*
karuṇayā ujjvalam āvalitam guṇaiḥ |
iha hi durlabham aṅga suyauvanam
jagati kānanam ambaragam yathā || I.20·43

Translation—O son, auspicous youth adorned with modesty, having noble sages as its abode (or which is a pleasant shelter for the good), shining with compassion, filled with virtues (like tranquillity, sease-control) is indeed very rare in this world, just as the heavenly garden which is adorned with desire-yielding trees which attract birds, which is a resort of the gods, which is exalted due to compassion, which is full of excellences (like richness of flowers, fruits etc.) (or which is full of the tendrils of desire-yielding creepers) is rare in this world.

This is an instance of Vākyagā Śrautī Pūrṇā Upamā.
Upameya—Yauvanam ; Upamāna—Ambaragam Kānanam ;
Sādharmya—Vinayabhūṣitam, āryajanāspadam, karuṇayā ujjvalam, guṇaiḥ āvalitam, jagati durlabham ;

Vādi—Yathā.

The objectives forming the sādharmya being Śliṣṭa, except 'durlabham' this can be treated as Śliṣṭopamā, as these adjectives add to the charm of the simile and are thus essential to it.

3. *yathā uṣasi pravṛttāyām ālokaḥ avaśyam eṣyati* |
asyām vā cittamātrāyām suvivekaḥ tathā eṣyati || II.18·5

Translation—Just as at the commencement of dawn the light will certainly come, similarly, when this work is understood, the wholesome discrimination will (certainly) arise,

This is an instance of Vākyagā Śrautī Pūrṇā Upamā.
Upameya—Suvivekaḥ ; Upamāna—Āloka ;
Sādharmya—Eṣyati ; Vādi—Yathā.. Tathā.

The idea that wholesome discrimination necessarily arises on the study of this work has been effectively conveyed by comparing the discrimination to the light that necessarily comes at the commencement of dawn.

4. *nirvāpitajagadyātraḥ kṛtakartavyasusthitaḥ |*
samastajanatārambhavajrastambhaḥ nabhonibhaḥ ||
II.17·43

Translation—The Jīvanmukta has put an end to the transmigration in the world ; is happy as he has done his duty ; is the diamond-pillar for (reflecting and supporting) all the activities of the people and resembles the sky (in being untainted by those activities of the people).

Nabhonibhaḥ Jīvanmuktaḥ : this is an instance of Samāsagā Ārthī Dharmaluptā Upamā.

Upameya—Jīvanmuktaḥ ; Upamāna—Nabhaḥ ;
Sādharmya—Nirlepata (Omitted) ; Vādi—Nibha (compounded with Upamāna).

5. *ullāsabahulānantakallolān alam ākulān |*
jaḍān pravahati sphārān prāvṛṣi iva taraṅgiṇī || I.13·2

Translation—Wealth drags a large number of greatly confused fools who are full of enthusiasm and have endless desires just as a river in rainy season bears innumerable big waves which are turbid, greatly agitated and massive due to upward splashing.

This is an instance of Samāsagā Śrautī Pūrṇā Upamā.
Upameya—Śrīḥ ; Upamāna—Prāvṛṣi Taraṅgiṇī ;
Sādharmya—Ullāsabahulānantakallolān alam ākulān jaḍān pravahati ; Vādi—Iva.

The words forming the common property being śliṣṭa, this is an instance of Śliṣṭopamā.

6. *himāśaniḥ iva ambhojam vātyā iva śaradambukam |*
deham jarā nāśayati nadī tīratarum yathā || I.22·2

Translation—Old age destroys the body just as snow resembling a thunderbolt destroys a lotus, just as a gale destroys the water (sticking to grass) in autumn season, and just as a river destroys a tree on the bank.

This is an instance of Mālopamā.
Upameya—Jarā ; Upamāna—Himāśaniḥ, Vātyā, Nadī ;
Sādharmya—Nāśayati ; Vādi—Iva.

This is an instance of Samāsagā Śrautī pūrṇā Mālopamā with one and the same common property.
Himāśaniḥ—is an instance of Samāsagā Ārthī Dharmavādiluptā Upamā ; Upameya—Hima ; Upamāna—Aśaniḥ (compounded) ; Sādharmya—Vināśakaratva (omitted) ; Vādi—Omitted.

7. *mātari iva param yānti viṣamāni mṛdūni ca /*
viśvāsam iha bhūtāni sarvāṇi śamaśālini // II.13·61.

Translation—The cruel and gentle beings—all attain confidence in a man shining with tranquillity, just as they attain confidence in mother.

This is an instance of Samāsagā Śrautī pūrṇā Upamā.

Upameya—Śamaśālin ; Upamāna—Mātā ;
Sādharmya—Param viśvāsam yānti ; Vādi—Iva.

In all 480 such instances of various types of Upamā have been noted.

RŪPAKA

Ekadeśavivarti Rūpaka :

1. *yāminīpaṅkakalitām dinakokanadāvalīm /*
meghabhramarikām ātmasarasi āropayan sthitaḥ // I·23·34.

Translation—Kāla (Time) stands planting in the lake in the form of his self, the row of lotuses in the form of days with mud in the form of nights sticking to it and having bees in the form of clouds (about it).

Kāla (implicitly identified with a gardner) is said to be planting in the ātma-saras, Yāminī-paṅka and megha-bhramara. Thus, one upamāna being implied, this is an instance of Ekadeśavivarti Rūpaka.

2. *saṁsāravṛnde mahati nānārasasamākule /*
bhuvanābhogaraṅgeṣu tṛṣṇā jaraṭhanartakī // I.17·23

Translation—In the great (theatre in the form of) the group of worldly lives, that is full of various sentiments, on stages in the form of expansive worlds, Desire, the old (i.e. mature) dancer (keeps dancing).

Saṁsāravṛnda (prekṣāgṛha) is the chief metaphor, the details of which are supplied by the remaining two metaphors viz. bhuvanābhogaraṅgaḥ and tṛṣṇā-jaraṭha-nartakī. By calling tṛṣṇā a jaraṭhanartakī, the poet intends to convey the idea that tṛṣṇā is a very mature and therefore untiring dancer. Thus, with one Upamāna implied, this is an instance of Ekadeśavivarti Rūpaka.

Samastavastuviṣaya Rūpaka :

1. *hṛdi ākāśe vivekārke śamālokini nirmale /*
anarthasārthakartāraḥ na udyanti kila ketavaḥ // II.18·21.

Translation—In the bright sky in the form of pure mind having the Sun in the form of discrimination and the light in the form of tranquillity, the comets (in the form of passions) which create (i.e. forebode) a number of calamities, do not rise.

Hṛd-ākāśa with Viveka-arka and Śama-āloka is described here. Thus, this is an instance of Samastavastuviṣaya Rūpaka. 'Ketavaḥ' is an instance of Nigīryādhyavasānarūpā Atiśayokti since the Upameya Kāmādayaḥ is suppressed therein.

In addition to such comparatively limited complex metaphors, we also come across, a number of sustained metaphors developed over from 8 to 32 lines which reveal the untiring zeal of the poet in giving detailed description of the objects under discussion. e. g.

(*a*) I. 31·1-6 : This passage develops the metaphor of Jīvitāṭavī, (Forest scene in rainy season superimposed on Life).

(*b*) I. 18·5-8 : This passage develops the metaphor of Dehavṛkṣa with vikāsasmita-puṣpa having dantakesarāḥ, ghanaskandhas (Śliṣṭa-strong shoulders and branch-roots), dvijas (Śliṣṭa-teeth and birds), locana-bilāni, Śiraḥpīṭhabṛhatphala, Śrava-dantakesarau (ears-kāṣṭakukkuṭa birds), Hastapādasupallavaḥ...Jīva-pānthagaṇa etc.

(*c*) I. 18·12-17 : This passage develops the metaphor of kāyaplakṣa, (A Fig-tree in the form of body).

(*d*) I. 18·19-34 : This passage develops the metaphor of Dehagṛha with an imposing array of details.

The refrain ' Na iṣṭam dehagṛham mama ' emphasises the mood of detachment of the speaker viz. Rāma. A few details may be noted : Deha-gṛha—with indriya-paśavaḥ, tṛṣṇā-gṛhāṅganā, pṛṣṭhāsthikāṣṭham, āntra-rajjavaḥ, snāyu-tantrīs, raktāmbu-kardama jarā-maṅkola (white wash of oldage), cintā-duhitā, jihvā-markaṭikā in vadanadvāra, smita-dīpa etc. etc..

(*e*) I.25. 10—21 : This passage develops the metaphor of Niyati-Nartakī.

(*f*) I.25. 22—32 : This passage develops the metaphor of Kṛtāntanartaka.

(*g*) I.24 1—10 : This passage develops the metaphor of Kāla-Rājaputra.

Paramparita Rūpaka :

1. *tāvat nayati saṁkocam tṛṣṇā vai mānavāmbujam* /
yāvat vivekasūryasya na uditā vimalā prabhā // II.13.20

Translation—The (night in the form of) Desire keeps the lotus in the form of man closed till the bright light of the Sun in the form of discrimination has not arisen.

Tṛṣṇā-rātriḥ or Viveka-sūrya-either of these two can be taken as the causative metaphor. Narāmbuja is the consequential metaphor.

2. *eṣā hi visamā duḥkhabhoginām gahanā guhā* /
ghanamohagajendrāṇām vindhyaśailamahātaṭī // I.13.12.

Translation—This (wealth) is a deep and difficult cave for the serpents in the form of sorrows ; it is the great slope of Vindhya mountain for lordly elephants in the form of dense delusion.

This is an example of Mālāparaṁparita Rūpaka. Wealth is described here with two pairs of metaphors.

1. Duḥkha-bhoginaḥ—Śrīḥ-gahanāguhā ;
2. Ghanamohagajendrāḥ—Vindhya-śailamahātaṭī.

The first metaphor in each pair causes the second one.

In all 15 illustrations of Ekadeśavivartī Rūpaka, 77 illustrations of Samastavastuviṣaya Rūpaka, 63 illustrations of Paraṁparita Rūpaka and 107 illustrations of Śuddha Rūpaka have been found in the present corpus.

The corpus abounds in the illustrations of the other Figures of Sense also, though their number is much smaller than that of the illustrations of the Upamā and the Rūpaka.

ATIŚAYOKTI

Nigīryādhyavasānarūpā atiśayokti :

1. *svavivekavāśāt eva vicārya idam punaḥ punaḥ |*
indrajālam parityājyam sabāhyābhyantaram balāt ||
II.11.27

The word indrajālam is an instance of Atiśayokti ; the Upameya Saṁsāra is suppressed therein.

Sambandhe asambandharūpā and asambandhe sambandharūpā atiśayokti :

1. *taraṅgam pratibimbendum taḍitpuñjam nabhombujam |*
grahītum āsthām badhnāmi na tu āyuṣi hatasthitau ||
I.14.7.

Translation:—I feel confidence about seizing a wave, the moon's reflections (and) a cluster of lightings (and even) a sky-lotus ; but never about the life which is utterly unstable.

Taraṅga, Pratibimbendu, taḍitpuñja and nabhombujam are really not the objects of grahaṇa-āsthā and yet they are said to be so here. Thus it is an instance of asambandhe sambandharūpā atiśayokti. 'Na tu āyuṣi hatasthitau'—is an instance of Sambandhe asambandharūpā atiśayokti. One does (and in normal circumstances Rāma would also) feel confidence about life ; but it is denied here.

APRASTUTAPRAŚAMSĀ

1. *vṛkṣāḥ prativanam santi nityam saphalapallavāḥ |*
na tu apūrvacamatkāraḥ lavaṅgaḥ sulabhaḥ sadā // I.33.41

Through the statement of the Aprastuta, two varieties of trees, the poet suggests the Prastuta viz. ordinarily good people who are found everywhere and contrasted with them the true Jñānins with a pure mind, who are rare.

UTPREKṢĀ

Utprekṣā of verbs :

1. *śailārṇadyudharā sṛṅgajagadūrṇāyuśaunikaḥ |*
pratyaham pibate prekṣya tārāraktakaṇān api // I.23.41.

Translation— Seeing the blood drops in the form of stars, the butcher (Kāla) (killing) the rams in the form of the worlds with horns in the form of mountains, oceans, the heaven and the earth, licks them too everyday.

The verse contains a samastavastuviṣaya Rūpaka. Kāla is identified with a butcher. He kills the rams in the form of the worlds. . . The stars are identified with blood drops. Based on this metaphor (viz. tārāraktakaṇān) is the Utprekṣā in 'pibate.'

The withdrawal of stars every morning by Time is fancied to be his licking the drops of blood in the form of stars. This is a Gamyā Utprekṣā (Cp. Pibate leḍhi iti utprekṣā—Ānandabodha). Thus, there is Aṅgāṅgibhāvasaṁkara of Rūpaka and Utprekṣā. This Saṁkara is finally subservient to the chief metaphor of Kāla—Śaunaka.

Utprekṣā of nouns and adjectives :

1. *kaumudīvṛṣṭiḥ anyā iva dvitīyā iva arkamaṇḍalī |*
Saṁbhṛtā iva atikālena pūrṇacandraparamparā ||

I.33.10.

Translation—(The group of sages) was as if another shower of moon light, as if a second circle of the Suns (and) as if a series of full moons accumulated over a long period of time.

The group of sages is fancied to be another shower of moon-light etc.. These three fancies bring out the pleasant appearances, dazzling lustre and benevolent nature of the sages.

VYATIREKA

1. *api abdipānāt mahataḥ sumerūnmūlanāt api |*
api vahnyaśanāt sādho viṣamaḥ cittanigrahaḥ || I.6.24

The control of mind (Upameya) is said to be superior to the mighty tasks like drinking the ocean, uprooting the Meru mountain and eating fire (three Upamānas). The common quality between them is Viṣamatva. It is ākṣipta. The point of excellence in the Upameya is its viṣamataratva which is clearly expressed. This is an instance of Vyatireka in Mālā form.

Figures of Sound (*Śabdālaṁkāras*) :

The following varieties of Śabdālaṁkāras are found used in the present corpus : Anuprāsa—Varṇānuprāsa ; Chekānuprāsa, Vṛtyanuprāsa-four varieties ; Śruttyanuprāsa, Padāntaga Antyānuprāsa and Pādāntaga Antyānuprāsa ; Śabdānuprāsa or Lāṭānuprāsa-five varieties ; Yamaka and Repetition of phrases or words in a set of verses .

CHEKĀNUPRĀSA

1. *hārdāndhakārakāriṇyā bhairavākāravānapi /*
yauvanājñānayāminyā bibheti Bhagavānapi // I.20.15

Hārdāndhakārakāriṇyā—This is an instance of Chekānuprāsa —A group of consonants *k* and *r* is repeated once.

hārdāndhakārakāriṇyā. . .
yauvanājñānayāminyā. . . .

This is an instance of Pādabhāga Sandaṣṭaka Yamaka—A part of the second foot is repeated in the fourth.

Bhairavākāravānapi—This is an instance of irregular type of Yamaka the letters *ravā* are repeated in the same foot.

Yauvanājñānayāminyā—This word contains an instance of Vṛttyanuprāsa—Single consonants *Y* and *N* are repeated two times each.

2. *lobhayanto bhayāyaiva viṣayābhogabhoginaḥ /*
Bhaṅgurākāravibhavāḥ kathamāyānti bhavyatām //
I.30.15.

Lobhayanto Bhayāyaiva . . . .
. . . . vibhavāḥ bhavyatām

These are two instances of Chekānuprāsa—groups of consonants *bh*, *y* and *bh*, *v* are repeated once each.

Viṣayābhogabhoginaḥ—This is an instance of Ekasamāsagata Nāmagata Lāṭānuprāsa.

Figures of speech and the Main Rasa :

Words and expressed sense gain in power to suggest Sentiments (Rasas) by virtue of the figures of speech. The figures of speech form the very system of Vibhāvas, Anubhāvas and Vyabhicāribhāvas of a Rasa. The YV. fully bears out the truth of these statements.

As pointed out in the definition, Śānta Rasa has the whole world realised to be illusory as its Ālambana Vibhāva, knowledge of the truth, purity of mind, company of the passionless souls, description of the great power of deities, holy places, penance, listening to the recitation of sacred texts etc. as its Uddīpana Vibhāvas, the five restraints, observance of the five rules, study of philosophy, compassion to all living beings, discharging one's own duties in a spirit of detachment etc. as its Anubhāvas and Nirveda (first), Śauca, Cintā, Jugupsā, Ratī etc. as its Vyabhicārī bhāvas. With an effective delineation through the figures of these factors, the Sthāyin Nirveda (Second sense—viz. Vairāgya) is suggested and developed into an abiding Sentiment by our poet.

Ālambana Vibhāva :

The whole world realised to be illusory :

The following expressions embodying various figures of speech as noted against them have been employed by the poet to impress upon the reader's mind the illusory nature of this world :

(1) Indrajālam—Atiśayokti—II.11.27
Upamā II.3.11 II.12.13.

(2) Jagadbhramaḥ—Śuddha Rūpaka—I.10.38—II.3.17.
—I.28.26.

(3) Saṁsārāmayaḥ—Rūpaka—II.13.32.

(4) Saṁsāraciravetālaḥ—Śuddha Rūpaka—II.14.27.
Dṛśyadraṣṭṛpiśācaḥ—Rūpaka & Upamā—II.18.37.
Rātrau nabhasi vetālaḥ—Arthāntaranyāsa—II.14.25-26.
Trastabālapiśāce—Upamā—II.3.11,13.
Cittabhramapiśāca—Upamā—II.17.18,28.

(5) Ākāśavarṇa—Upamā—I.3.2,I.3.5.
Nabhasi Nīlatvam—Upamā—II.17.22.

(6) Manorājya—Upamā—I.23.17 ; II.3.11 ; II.17.18.

(7) Saṁkalpanagara—Rūpaka and Upamā—II.18.39
Upamā—II.3.11, 13.

(8) Svapnasaṅgama—Upamā—I.28.1; II.3.11, 13; II.17.18, 28.

(9) Citrasarpa—Upamā—II.18-40, 41.
Citrānalaḥ—Upamā—II.17.18—28.

Mālopamās :

(a) Svapnopalambhabhāva—Upamā, II.17.18 to 28
(b) Gandharvanagara
(c) Dvicandrabhrama
(b) Mṛgatṛṣṇāmbuvartana
(e) Nauyāṇalolaśaila
(f) Maraṇavyagracittam
(g) Cittabhramapiśāca
(h) Hemni Kaṭakatva
(i) Ambhasi Taraṅgatvam
(j) Griṣme vanam
(k) Paṅkāt abhiracitaṃ krīḍanakam.

Uddīpana Vibhāvas—

(a) Tattvajñāna—Knowledge of Truth is the principal Uddīpana of Śānta. The effficacy of knowledge in the path of liberation is emphasized in the following figurative expressions :

(1) Apārasaṁsārasamudrapātī . . . . . na śokam āyāti na dainyam eti (Viśeṣokti—1.2.31)
Aṅgāṅgibhāvasaṁkara of Rūpaka and Viśeṣokti Saṁsṛṣṭi with Kārakadīpaka.

(2) Agnau patatā api na dahyate
pāvake pāradena iva rasena (Viśeṣokti—I.31.13)
Aṅgāṅgibhāvasaṁkara of Atiśayokti-1 and Viśeṣokti. Saṁsṛṣṭi with Upamā.

(6) Yogagāruḍamantra . . . saṁsāraviṣāveśaviṣūcikā (Paraṁparita Rūpaka—II.12.10).

(*b*) Praise of manly efforts—as an Uddīpana Vibhāva :

(1) Pauruṣeṇa jitāḥ daityāḥ . . . Viṣṇunā . . .
(Aprastutapraśaṁsā—II.7.31).

(2) Na yatnenāpi mahatā prāpyate ratnam aśmataḥ/
(Arthāntaranyāse—II.5.23).

(*c*) Praise of the Yogavāsiṣṭha as guide on the path of Liberation— as an Uddīpana Vibhāva :

Puṇyakalpadrumaḥ yasya phalabhārānataḥ /
Tasya idam śrotum udyamaḥ .. (Śuddha Rūpaka. II.17.4.)

Vyabhicārī bhāvas : Jugupsā : Jugupsā from ignorant ones is developed by employing the following figurative expressions for them :

(1) paśavaḥ—(Śuddha Rūpaka—II.5.30 etc.)
(Atiśayokti—I.33.36).

(2) Vyādhi, viṣa, āpat and ādhi excelled by Maurkhya—
(Vyatireka—10—II.13.13).

Jugupsā from wordly life is developed by employing the following figurative expressions :

(1) Saṁsārapaṅka—(Śuddha Rūpaka—I.30.13).

(2) Dyauḥ kṣamā . . . vināśavāḍavasya etat saṁśuṣkam indhanam // (Tulyayogitā—I.28.22, 23).

(3) Jālapañjara, phalam mukurabimbitam—(Dṛṣṭānta I.23.2.)

(4) Jagatsvarūpe manorame, aramye—(Virodha—I.27.1)

Jugupsā from Kāla :

(1) Bhinatti bhūtabījāni dāḍimāni yathā śukaḥ—

Aṅgāṅgibhāvasaṁkara of Rūpaka and Utprekṣā and Upamā—I.23.12.

(2) Harati nāśayati karoti . . . saṁsāranṛttam—
Kāraka Dīpaka and Rūpaka—I.23.11.—32.

Anubhāvas of Śānta—Aparigraha—(Non-possession of worldly goods) :

(1) Na aham dehasya na dehaḥ mama ... te mune puruṣottamāḥ //
(Parisaṁkhyā—I.18.53, II.13.79).

(2) Bhogaśriḥ atulā teṣām eṣā prativiṣāyate—(Upamā—II .15.4)

Śauca—Purity

Ākāśasadṛśī yasya . . . kalaṅkam eti na matiḥ /
sa śāntaḥ iti kathyate //

(Saṁsṛṣṭi of Upamā and Parisaṁkhyā—II.13.80).

From the foregoing analysis it will be clear that the figures of speech in the YV. are Rasākṣipta and they do not appear to be hanging loosely on the poem as external decorations. The intention of the poet naturally takes the shape of a figure. Even the sounds are suggestive of the Mādhuryaguṇa. Thus the Upamā helped by the Vṛttyanuprāsa of *nd* and the Vṛttyanuprāsa of *m* and *l* serves as Uddīpana Vibhāva of Śanta in—

mandākinīm indunibhām kālindīm ca utpalamālām I.3.33.

The analysis of the Śabdālaṁkāras reveals that the basic quality of the present poem is Mādhuryaguṇa in keeping with its principal sentiment viz Śānta. Occasionally it shows a variation as demanded by the Vyabhicārin intended to be developed. But when the need is over, his poem resumes its natural quality viz. Mādhuryaguṇa.

Prasāda is the quality that pervades the whole poem. The poet never shows fondness for recondite expressions or involved constructions. Mark the Prasāda guṇa in the following verse :

mānase sarasi svacche vicārakamalotkaraḥ /
nūnam vikasitaḥ yasya himavān iva bhāti saḥ // II.14.16.

The study of the YV. reveals that the author whose mind had fed on the classics of the great poets of India like Vyāsa, Vālmiki, Kālidāsa, Bāṇa, Bhavabhūti and others, wanted to set forth the Truth which he had grasped through his deep study of the Philosophical works like Upanisads, and those of Buddhism, Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism, in an attractive form. Great is the influence of the classical and philosophical literature available in his time on the author of the YV. But the YV. reveals not only the study of the great works of the predecessors on the part of the author, but also the close observation by him of the Nature and human world around him.

A lofty vision of life is the inspiration of the author of the YV. as it was of Vālmīki and Aśvaghoṣa whose technique he has freely borrowed.

Giving a message of hope to entire humanity through its ideal of Jīvanmukta, the YV., with its profound idealistic philosophy can certainly rank as a great work of literature. The work was certainly 'that something of the soul of humanity' which Macmillan demands from a great literary work in his '*Appreciation*' or to use the words of Jñāneśvara '*Paratattva sparśu*'.

The *Yogavāsiṣtha* is great also because it has profoundly influenced its successors like Jñāneśvara in Marathi and Tulsidāsa in Hindi. Rāma as depicted in the works of Tulsidāsa seems to be the very embodiment of the Jīvanmukta described in the *Yogavāsiṣtha*.

SOCIOLOGY

VEDIC HINDU AND TRIBAL MARRIAGE*

USHA M. APTE

Explanation and analysis of the phenomena of social change has attained pivotal importance during last few decades amongst the social scientists. Herein an attempt has been made to understand the impact of culture contact on the tribals as well as the civilized people with reference to ritual and social aspects of marriage.

The present problem finds its origin in my first book, '*The Sacrament of Marriage in Hindu Society—from Vedic period to Dharma śāstras*.' The study of the Vedic and Hindu marriage of the *sūtra* and *śāstra* period raised some doubts. The marriage rituals prescribed by the *Gṛhyasūtras* are fully developed and complicated as compared to those of the Vedic period. Moreover there is a vast difference between the social practises of these periods. It occurred to me that perhaps the matrix of these may be revealed by studying tribal marriages. Originality of this research project is in the fact that although economic, political and educational aspects of tribal India are attracting considerable attention to-day, this work concerns itself with cultural aspect wherein there is 'give and take' from both the sides. Both the cultures share a lot as a result of contact with each other.

The Vedic marriage and the marriage of the *sūtra* period (circa 1000 A.D.) and the present Hindu marriage shows great change and development. The rites like '*ghāṇā*' (pounding rice or any other unhusked grain), washing feet, sprinkling the bride with *surā* i.e. liquor (*Kāṭhaka Grs.*, II. 5.2), using clay-balls (*Kāt.Grs.* p.54-55, *Āśv.Grs.* I.V.5, *Bhā.Gṛs.* I, 11. p.11) have perhaps a tribal origin. On the other hand some of the tribes have rites of *homa* (e.g. the Grasias or the *Choriwala* Dhodias) Kaṅkaṇa (the Lambadas, the Dublas and the Dhodias) and circumambulations (Most of the tribes, studied, perform this rite) which are possibly adopted from the Vedic marriage. During the process of adoption, the rite itself undergoes some change and assumes the tribal or civilized character as the case may be. There is one more aspect of this culture-change. It has been found that some tribes e.g. the Dorlas of Madhya Pradesh and the Koyas of South India, use yoke in their marriage rites. This may be because they belong to one and the same stock or because they came in each other's contact while travelling from one place to another. Some rites e.g. *vastrāntarakaraṇa* or the rite of separating curtain has suddenly appeared in the Hindu marriage around 1400 A.D. especially only in Western India. Some of the tribes from this region and Madhya Pradesh have a similar rite. An attempt has been made to find out the meaning and origin of these rites in order to understand the phenomena of social change.

---

* Work done as Post-Doctorate Research in 1978-80; Published by AWARE, Hyderabad.

As rites have undergone a marked change in this period, social customs and practices have also undergone drastic changes. e.g. age of the bride. In the Vedic period marriages of mature girls capable of running the household were performed (*Samrājñī Śvaṣure bhava*), But in the age of Smṛtikāras it was obligatory for the father to arrange for his daughter's marriage, before she attained puberty (*aṣṭavarṣā bhavet kanyā*). Further in the Vedic period the young people were expected to choose their life-partners and were allowed certain freedom. But with the advance of child-marriage the situation changed completely. What is the condition of the tribes about these matters? It is found that the tribal atmosphere matches more favourably with the Vedic one. Similarly the atmosphere in Western countries suggests a comparison with the tribal one.

Method of Work :

It is evident that such a comparative work presupposes study of the Vedic and the Hindu marriage on the one hand and the tribal marriages on the other. The former has been achieved in my book on '*The Sacrament of Marriage in Hindu Society*'. About the latter I decided to study the marriage rites and practices of as many tribes as possible. The study of about fifty tribes from the above mentioned point of view is presented in this work. For the sake of convenience these tribes are divided into four parts viz.—(1) South India, (2) Western India, (3) Madhya Pradesha and (4) North eastern India. All these tribes have been treated as Indian tribes who preserve traits of non-Vedic culture.

Each note starts with an introduction which gives a general picture of that tribe including its racial and linguistic affinities, contraversies if any about its origin, habitat, manner of dress, gods worshipped and festivals. The introduction is followed by the study of marriage customs, endogamy, exogamy etc., negotions, betrothal, marriage ritual and widow remarriage. The first of these includes various forms of marriage, customs regarding remarriage, age of marriage and attitude towards pre-marital and post-marital sex relations and other social customs concerning marriage. The Todas is the only polyandrous tribe critically studied here. It has received a thorough treatment including the special sexual practices and status of women. During the exposition of each tribe the similarities of the tribal, Vedic and the Hindu rites and practises are noted. Similarly inter-tribal parallel practices are also mentioned. All these are discussed later on in the conclusion.

Each section has its own conclusion. Observations regarding parallel rites and practices are discussed here. The last chapter viz. the Vedic Marriage, the Hindu Marriage and the Tribal Marriage summerises and critically views all the four conclusions.

It may be mentioned here that the word 'Hindu Marriage' is used to denote the marriage as described by the authors of the *Gṛhyasūtras*. It mainly consists of the rites of *Kanyādāna* (gift of daughter), *Agniparinayana* (circumambulations), *Hastagrahaṇa* (holding hands), *Lājāhoma* (offering of prached rice), and *aśmārohaṇa* (stepping on a stone). These rites are observed almost all over India since the age of the Sūtrakāras (circa 900 A.D.).

Sources of Information :

As the title indicates this work needs information about the tribal, Vedic and Hindu marriages. For the latter two I have wholly depended on my above mentioned book. In this work are discussed all the texts concerning ritual and practices from the Vedas to the *Smṛti* works. For the former I have relied upon the monographs and the other works on the tribes, the ethnographic notes of the *Census Reports of India* and field work. As one is aware veteran scholars like V. Elwin, U. R. Ehrenfels, C. Von. Furer Haimendorf, W. Ruben, G. S. Ghurye, D. N. Majumdar, L. N. Chapekar, P. C. Biswas and others have experienced the actual life of the tribals and have published their works on different tribes. I have made full use of these. Another set of works that has been utilised are the encyclopaedic works by E. Thurston, H. Risley, R. C. Enthoven, A. Aiyappan, S. Fuchs U. L. Siraj Hassansyed, E. T. Dalton and others. Thirdly I have also depended on the ethnographic notes published as part of the *Census Reports*. These certainly give a detailed bibliography and the latest information of the tribes under considertion. I am aware that the *Census Reports* have their own limitations but I have relied upon them as they give authentic and latest available information.

Normally the work on tribal life depends on actually experiencing and understanding their way of life. Since this work mainly depends on the information recorded by anthropologists and ethnographists, fieldwork was conducted only on sample basis. I visited fifteen tribes in all, from different states and recorded information revealed by these people.

Conclusions :

The conclusions arrived at, mainly the points of culture contact revealed by the research work are recorded in the last chapter. Some of them are as follows.

Polygamy and Polyandry :

Majority of the tribes are polyagamous. The reason behind this practice is mainly economic. As tribal families need more working hands, they prefer polygamy. Even women accept a younger co-wife without malice or jealousy as a fact of life. Only those people who do not have sufficient money to pay as bride-price and those who have very efficient and hard working wives choose monogamy. Some men marry more than one woman for procreating male child. Like the people of the plains, tribals also crave for male progeny. Amongst some of them, like the Gonds or the Bhils possession of more wives is a status symbol. One knows that until recently, till the law declared bigamy as illegal, even the Hindus had similar notions regarding polygamy.

Only a few tribes are noted to be polyandrous. The Todas from the Nilgiris and those from Jaunsar-bawar are recorded in this study. One interesting point about the Todas is that they worship the *Pāṇḍavas*, as their gods. Some of the Keral tribes are also recorded as being polyandrous in the past. One wonders whether the polyandrous marriage of the *Mahābhārata* heroes originates in the south of our country.

Forms of Marriage :

The tribals have innovated many ways of obtaining their life partners. In fact they follow, the *gāndharva*, *āsura* and *rākṣasa* forms of marriage. Further if a boy cannot afford to pay for his bride, he has an option to serve and pay for her, (the Waralis). He can also run away with her, if both of them choose to do so. A boy and a girl (especially the tribes of the Munda group) have a practice of forcefully entering the choosen partner's house, and staying there as the spouse of person concerned. The tribals also socially accept divorce and remarriage. One wonders, whether Manu, our dynamic law-giver, was aware of all these practices and tried to accommodate them in the eyes of the śāstrakāras. For Manu recognised eight forms of marriage and he also accepted *paunarbhava putra* though he himself never approved of these practices.

Dowry :

The Tribal India knows of a different dowry system wherein one pays for his bride, while the people of the plains pay for the bridegroom. One point of similarity is that in both the civilizations sort of buying is involved. Manu and other śāstrakāras are aware of the *āsura* form of marriage and *kanyāśulka*. But they are not aware of a sale of *varas* or the grooms. The tribals have, in their own way tried to solve the problem for those who do not have sufficient money to pay for the bride, by accepting marriage by service and marriage by elopement. Yet the Munda tribes have to face the problem of unmarried, grown up spinsters, because there are no sufficiently rich grooms.

Exogamy and Endogamy :

The tribals strictly follow rules of exogamy (*gotra* or *kula*) and they also forbid marriages outside the fold of the tribe. In fact the Dravidian word '*Gatta*' (used by the Gonds and also by some of the south Indian tribes) seems to be the origin of the word '*gotra*' meaning exogamous groups. The same word used in the Vedic texts denotes either a cow-pen or a cloud. The tribals are so much conscious of the effects of inter-marrying, that boy and girl belonging to one and the same class are not allowed to be dance-partners.

Attitude towards Sex and Marriage :

There is a world of difference between the attitude of the tribals and others towards sex and marriage. To the Hindus marriage is sacrament and a life-long affair. It is true that the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 allows divorce and remarriage. Yet, generally people do not like to go in for dissolution of marriage. Firstly, because we are still under the influence of the dogma that marriage is not breakable and secondly because marriage litigations are carried out on the same lines as other law suits and go on for years together. On the other hand, with the tribals, divorce and remarriage are fairly common for both the man and the woman. They try to solve the problem of marital discord from a practical point of view. The chiefs of the tribe give final verdict about divorce and also about the custody of children. The Toda marriage practices are very peculiar. A man or a woman is properly settled in life only after second or third marriage.

The tribal people are liberal so far as pre-marital and extra-marital sex-relations are concerned. Their attitude towards sex and marriage suggests a good comparison with that of the Westerners. The tribal life is full of opportunities for the young people to mix freely with each other. The privacy of the forests helps them to enjoy sex before marriage. During harvest and other festivals and dances also young people enjoy each other's company. Their life is more akin to nature. Same type of freedom is also observed during Vedic period where festivals like *samana* were organised (*RV.* I. 123, I. 115·2).

Because of their practical attitude towards sex and marriage tribals generally do not have problems of illegitimate children. If it is found that an unmarried girl is pregnant, it is compulsory for the young man to marry her. If he does not do so willingly, the chiefs accompanied by other members of the tribe catch hold of him and conduct the marriage rites. Similarly the tribals by themselves never had any problem of prostitution. In fact they were not aware of any such practice till they were introduced to it by their counterparts in the cities. In fact prostitution and orphanages are problems created by civilized people in our country.

Marriage Ritual :

As it is mentioned earlier the tribals do share their rituals with those performed by the non-tribals. *Saptapadī* i.e. (walking seven steps together) circumambulations (around pestle, post, yoke, marriage pandal or dias), applying turmeric and *sendur*, presenting *tālī* or blackbeads to the bride, stepping on the stone (the Gonds, Agarias and Bhumias), washing feet of the groom or bride and members of their party, are some of the rites and customs shared by people on the hills and the Hindus. Some of the practices are localized e.g. the tribals and non-tribals in Gujarath tie a *midhol* fruit in the *Kankan* of the bride and the groom. One more aspect of culture contact is whether the tribals share the symbolism of the Hindus.

Symbolism :

In the marriage ritual so many objects are used because of their symbolic significance e.g. rice, pestle, and probably yoke suggest fertility rite. The tribals use iron and other impliments, rattles, turmeric and collyrium to ward off the evils. Some Hindu marriages also have similar symbolism. Further sharing food and sharing agricultural work symbolically suggests that the couple must share work and earnings in the future to come. Like the Hindus, the tribals also use water-pots with mango-twigs and coconut as they are auspicious. One interesting reference to *madhūkamālā* in *Raghuvaṃśa* (VI.25) reminds one of the use of *mahuā* flowers and beer prepared from them by the tribals. Lastly people all over India and especially those in the Western, Southern and Eastern India make extensive use of betelnuts in the marriage ceremony. The Koyas worship wooden staff in their marriage, probably signifying ancestors. The same type of staff appears in '*caturthīkarma*' of the *śāstras*.

One of the interesting references is to giving away of the *malinavastra* or the dirty garment. *Sūryā Sūkta* (*RV*.X. 85.) clearly states that the garment is stained red and blue. The Walmikis from South India also have a similar practice at the time of puberty-rite for girls and not at the time of Nuptials. The girl is supposed to give away her dirty garment. One wonders if this is just a coincidence or some culture contact. The Walmikies regard themselves as descendants of Walmiki the First Poet who composed the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

Thus there are many points of culture-contact that are suggested by of this study.

87319

STOCK VERIFY
2020
G.K.V. Library

GURUKUL KANGRI LIBRARY
Access on
Class on
Cat on
Tag etc.
Checked
Any Other

5/5/88

S.V 1991
Varified by

STOCK VERIFY
2020
G.K.V. Library

COMPILED